A STUDY OF ATTITUDES IN THE AREA OF SUPERVISOR-NON-SUPERVISOR RELATIONS BETWEEN GROUPS OF NAVY AND CIVILIAN, MALE AND FEMALE, PERSONNEL

SAMUEL LAWRENCE SCHARF, JR.

Library
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

Mont 215
8854

Library
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Annapolis, Md.

Library
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Annapolis, Md.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES IN THE AREA OF SUPERVISOR-NON-SUPERVISOR RELATIONS BETWEEN GROUPS OF NAVY AND CIVILIAN, MALE AND FEMALE, PERSONNEL

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

DIVISION OF COMBINATED STUDIES

By

SAMUEL LAWRENCE SCHARF, JR.

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

July, 1949

THESIS
S25

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I acknowledge with deep appreciation the assistance and guidance of Dr. Robert E. Chancellor throughout this project.

I further appreciate the assistance rendered me in the field of statistical usefulness and methods by Dr. L. L. Cloud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	4
III	CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUMENT	7
IV	TESTING PROCEDURE	16
V	FACTUAL PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	17
VI	INTERPRETATION	58
VII	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	62
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	65
	APPENDIX A: Questionnaire	69
	APPENDIX B: First two pages of the questionnaire altered for Groups V and VI	70
	APPENDIX C: Selected summaries of Groups I-VI on Questions I-5	71

Section I

INTRODUCTION

In the Naval Establishment there are many activities where we find both military and civilian personnel, male and female, working in various combinations and levels of supervision. The complications resulting from these various interrelationships constitute a large proportion of the personnel problems that the executives and supervisors must face and attempt to solve.

In great part certain personnel problems arising from such special situations as (a) Navy personnel supervising civilian employees; (b) civilian employees supervising Navy personnel; (c) Navy personnel supervising Navy men, and (d) women supervising women, grow out of the attitudes these groups have towards themselves and each other. Anyone who has ever had a job knows that if he does not get along with either his supervisor or his co-workers the job is unsatisfactory as far as that worker is concerned. Usually the conflicts that he has are the results of attitudes towards his supervisor and co-workers. Thus (3, p. 44) refers to this situation when he states:

> All people have attitudes which result in tendencies to respond positively or negatively to another person, a group of people, an object, a situation involving objects and people, or an idea. Very often the presence of an attitude results from the individual to react in a specified direction. This being so, a knowledge of the attitude allows for the prediction of behavior.

In the naval establishment many of the personnel problems that we face are the results of the attitudes on the part of both the supervisor and the supervised, the same as is true in the industrial world. Only in addition to the interaction of civilian upon civilian, male and female, we in our problems must face the additional interaction of military personnel, male and female, upon not only other military personnel, male and female, but also upon civilian personnel. The morale in any organization—the will to do the job assigned—depends in large part upon the kinds of relationships that exist between the supervisory and non-supervisory personnel, Navy and civilian, male and female.

A report (14, p. 1) submitted to the Civil Service Assembly points out that:

> The curious phenomenon of individual differences in human personality and ability is at the root of most of our problems of social organization and relationships. The relationships between employees, in the rank and file, and employers, the supervisory staff, in or out of the public service, are no exception. The history of labor relations in or out of the public service is characterized by growth in discovery and recognition of the fact that people at work prefer to behave like human beings. The more special history of labor relations in the public service is featured by the added phenomenon that public employment which transforms a part of the individual citizen into a civil servant for a part of his twenty four hour day still finds his behaving very much like a human being.

This report (p. 5) further reveals that:

> Management, either public or private, justifiably devotes attention to employee relations because the quality of human relations determines the effectiveness of the staff above the minimum of mere compliance. Morale is that attitude which results from the mobilizing of energy, interest, and initiative in the enthusiastic and effective pursuit of a groups' purposes, Ordway Tead has written, and further, "It is only as he is interested in his relation to the organization that the morale factor begins to develop."[1]

---

1. O. Tead, Human Nature and Management, p. 171.

Before we go further into this discussion, let us set up for ourselves a working definition of the word "attitude." We shall define an attitude as a way of being "set" towards or against certain things. The essential feature of an attitude is a state of readiness to react (by thought or deed) in a certain way whenever anything related to the attitude is met. Attitudes are one of the most important psychological factors in determining how an individual will behave in a given social situation.

Supervisors have as many attitudes on as many things as non-supervisory personnel, and the two are usually somewhat different. Supervisors' attitudes may lead to incorrect assumptions about the supervised personnel, or the supervised behavior that is the antithesis of that which was assumed or predicted. Of course, the same is true of the supervised. There is a need to study supervisor-supervised attitudes in order to get more complete insight into the problem of supervisor-supervised relations.

In all of the morale surveys that have been made in the industrial field, one of the important factors that is always included is the relationship between the supervisor and the supervised. L. Wayne Arthur (MC) (1) also included this factor in his study (1) of civil service employees at Great Lakes, Illinois.

Brodsky (11, p. 37) points out that:

> A big factor in any person's willingness to work is his personal estimation of his immediate supervisor. If the supervisor has leadership ability he will be liked and respected by his subordinates. If he has only "drivership" ability he will be disliked and disrespected.

Ruchlisberger and Stevens (41, p. 57) state:

> ... knowledge of supervisor and supervisee attitudes must be obtained if a greater insight and a better relationship between the two groups is to exist.

Section II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study shall be a morale survey—but one limited to the extent that the field of supervisor-supervised relations alone shall be explored.

A difficulty that has been discussed by Millen and Millen (8) is:

> The more technology that accrues in the field, the more it is necessary to recognize factors that do not lend themselves easily to prediction, such as motivation or the "human element" of attitude. There is a growing realization that the personal adjustment of the individual affects his ability to adjust on the job. More and more recognition is being given to the fact that attitudes are as significant as abilities. The lack of a technology in handling attitudes is becoming more evident. Industrial experiments like those at the Western Electric Co. and at Jack and Heinz document the existence of such a need in the personnel area.

In addition this study shall embrace the attitudes of Navy and civilian personnel, male and female, in various levels of supervision towards their immediate supervisor. In order to measure these attitudes it is necessary to construct an instrument. This instrument will be in the form of a questionnaire. Criterion material for the questionnaire will be obtained from the following sources: (a) review of the literature in the field of supervisory and interpersonal relationships; and (b) from "guided interviews" with a group of experienced Navy and civilian supervisors, both male and female. The completed questionnaire will be administered to an experimental group of Navy and civilian, male and female personnel

in various levels and under various types of supervision. The reliability of the instrument will be determined by use of the products-moment method. Those areas of greatest or least conflict in the field of supervisory relations in each group and between the various groups will be noted.

Section III

CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire method of measuring attitudes was chosen for practical considerations. As Blum (8, p. 64) points out:

> The questionnaire lends itself to the mass production technique of determining employee attitudes. In some respects there is more similarity than difference between this method and the guided interview. Although these two methods overlap, the questionnaire is more economical because one person can administer it to a large group at one time. This method also has the advantage of eliminating any effect the interviewer may have on the respondent and of requiring not as much experience or training on the part of the interviewer as the other methods do. It has the disadvantage of securing no more information than that provided by the answers to the specific questions and of lacking the spontaneity of the unguided interview.

One of the disadvantages of the questionnaire method is the fact that no more information than that provided by the specific questions is obtained. In an attempt to overcome this it was decided to make use of some "open-end" questions to supplement the information obtained from the multiple-choice questions that were to form the core of the questionnaire. It was hoped that these would furnish in part the "why" of some of the responses in the set opinion questions.

Upon completion of the review of the literature in the field of supervisory relationships, a list of seventy-seven possible items was obtained. These seventy-seven items were next submitted to a group of six naval officers and other graduate students in a seminar in personnel work. Further assistance was obtained from a

group of male and female Navy Officers, and male and female civilian supervisors at Great Lakes, Illinois; Glenview, Illinois; and at the U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland. As a result of these discussions certain additions, deletions, and much simplification of wording was made. It was possible to reduce the number of items to forty, as there was great similarity between many of the original seventy-seven items.

The questionnaire in its completed form consisted of ten pages in three sections. The first section consisted of various status questions (questions A-H). These questions were to determine whether the subject was Navy or civilian, male or female, married or single; age; length of service; time on present job; kind of supervisor the subject had; if the subject was a supervisor (and if so, the kind of personnel he supervised) or a non-supervisor; the opinion he held of his immediate supervisor; and, in the case of supervisors, the opinion held of the supervised personnel. (Appendix A, pp. 63).

The second section consisted of forty multiple choice attitude questions. These were numbered from one through forty. These questions covered areas in supervisory relations from such things as whether the worker felt his immediate supervisor kept his promises, was impartial; easy to approach on personal or work problems; whether promotions went to the best qualified; whether training was provided; whether he forewarned the workers of changes that affected them, to such general things as the workers' feelings towards

women supervisors. (Appendix A, pp. 88). Each of the forty questions had a selection of five answers ranging from unfavorable response to the question through neutral to favorable response. The Likert technique was used (18). It was assumed that the intervals between each of the five possible responses was equal. Each interval had a score value. The more unfavorable response had a morale score value of one; the next unfavorable response a value of two; the neutral response had a value of three; the favorable response, a value of four; and the more favorable response, a morale score value of five. The person filling out the questionnaire was instructed to choose that answer which more nearly approximated his own feelings in each case.

The third and final part of the instrument consisted of various questions which asked for the specific likes and dislikes the individual had for Navy supervisors; civilian supervisors; male supervisors; and female supervisors. In addition there were questions which asked the subjects what the best way was to get along with their supervisors, and what would improve the supervisor. The final question allowed the subject to discuss anything that tended to make his job or job situation less satisfying. (Appendix A, pp. 88.) It was hoped that these questions would be a source of supplemental information, and perhaps point out the "why" of the responses in the multiple choice questions of part two.

A survey of the various commands in the Chicago area resulted in the discovery that there were no activities employing adequate

numbers of Navy and civilian, male and female workers in the same department where a survey could be conducted. Therefore, for practical considerations, populations were obtained from several commands, and from various departments within these commands, in the Ninth Naval District. As this study is experimental in nature, and as the opinions expressed are the subjective opinions of the subjects, not verified by objective investigation, it was decided not to identify the commands except in a very broad and general manner. The results of this study will be submitted to the responsible officers in each command for whatever investigation and further study deemed necessary.

The civilian subjects of this experiment were selected from a supply command within the Ninth Naval District. The Commanding Officer of this activity granted permission to use a ten per cent sample of the total number of workers (over 600) in the command. The sample could have been taken from the entire organization, or from one or more of the six departments comprising the activity. The total number of subjects available was sixty-one. It was decided to make comparisons between two of the departments doing quite similar work. An equal number of men and women from each of the departments was needed for the experiment. In order to take a random sample of equal groups of men and women of these populations, it was first necessary to divide the personnel cards of these departments by sex. The cards were not arranged alphabetically, but by C.A.P. ratings. Thus by taking the name of the worker appearing on every fourth card a stratified random sample was obtained. Sixteen men and fifteen

women were obtained from the first department which employed one hundred and fourteen workers. This was slightly better than a thirty per cent sample of the department. Fifteen men and fifteen women were obtained from the second department, which employed one hundred and three workers. This was a thirty per cent sample of the department.

When the stencils were cut for the questionnaire the study was to be limited to the civilian workers at the supply activity having both Navy and other civilians, male and female, as their supervisors. Later it was determined to include a group of male and female enlisted personnel in the study. Therefore, it became necessary to alter the status information by adding categories 7-12 on questions A and E, and category 8 to question F. (Appendix B).

The Navy personnel selected for the experiment were obtained from an entirely different command. As the number of enlisted Waves at any one command is necessarily small, an attempt was made to obtain as large a percentage of the total population as possible. The same attempt was made in the case of the Negro and Filipino enlisted personnel.

For the purpose of this study, the subjects are divided into six groups. Hereafter these groups shall be designated as Group I, Group II, etc. But first let us define each of these groups.

Group I - consists of sixteen male civilians from what we shall designate as Department "A" of the supply activity within the Ninth Naval District selected for the experiment.

Group II - consists of fifteen female civilians from the same Department "A".

Group III - consists of fifteen male civilians from what we shall designate as Department "B" of the supply activity.

Group IV - consists of fifteen female civilians from the same Department "B".

Group V - consists of fifteen Navy enlisted personnel working within various departments of another command in the Ninth Naval District.

Group VI - consists of twenty-five Negro and Filipino enlisted personnel assigned duties at a B.O.Q. within the Ninth Naval District.

Section IV

TESTING PROCEDURE

The procedures used with the various groups vary to some extent. Therefore a discussion of the procedure applicable to each of the groups follows.

Permission was obtained to schedule the administration of the questionnaire to the civilian workers of the supply activity at 1630 on 5 May 1941. At that time the sample group from Department "A" was told to report to the classroom on the third floor. A questionnaire had been left on every other seat together with a pencil. The workers reported there and were assembled and ready for the test at 1630 promptly. The purpose of the project was explained to them, together with the reason why they had been selected and not some of the other workers who were still busy at their desks in the department. The group was assured that no attempt would be made to find out who had written the information on the questionnaire. It was further pointed out that for the project to be a success it would be essential that their frank opinions were obtained. Their cooperation was requested. They were asked to place the completed questionnaire face down on the table at the door as they left the room.

There were no physical facilities available on the second floor where the test group of Department "B" could be assembled. Therefore it was necessary to pass out the questionnaires to the selected group at their desks, with the request that they return the completed

questionnaires by placing them upon a designated desk in the front of the office before they left. It was not possible to make any supplementary introductory remarks to the group as a whole. Nor was it possible to reassure them, or attempt to dispel any doubts they might have about participating frankly in the investigation. It was also not possible to explain to them how they were selected for the investigation. However, there are instructions and other information appearing on the questionnaire which was adapted to explain in part the "how" and the "why" of the investigation. However, it became obvious that these were not optimal conditions under which to administer a questionnaire of this nature.

At 1550 the questionnaires from Department "A" had all been placed on the table at the door to the classroom. Several of the selected group were still waiting around to discuss the questionnaire. They were told to wait until the questionnaires from the group on the second floor had been picked up. Not all of the questionnaires had been returned—a few of the selected group were still filling out their questionnaires, but it was obvious that some had taken their questionnaires home with them—or else stuck them in their desks. As the group was spread out over the whole office it was not possible to maintain a closer check on them. The only check that was possible was reliance upon their cooperation. Never questionnaires were missing. A forwarding address was left with the department head with the request that the completed questionnaires be mailed by the individuals to insure anonymity. These questionnaires were received on 7 May 1949.

Received on 7 May 2000.

Those who waited around to discuss the questionnaire further made such typical comments as: "I could write a book about these kinds of things if I had the time"; and "I feel so much better after writing about some of the things that have been under my skin for so long."

There were thirty-one enlisted Waves on duty at the command where this part of the experiment was made. These Waves were assigned duties in various offices scattered throughout the command. As it was not possible or practical to assemble the entire group in order to administer the questionnaire, it was decided to distribute the questionnaires by guard mail on 4 May to the various offices where enlisted Waves were assigned duty. Of the thirty-one questionnaires distributed, nineteen were returned. Of these, four had to be discarded due to the fact that large portions were incomplete. This gave a forty-nine per cent sample of the population. Questionnaires were received by mail by 13 May 1949.

There were thirty-three Negro and Filipino enlisted men assigned duty at the N.O.B. of the command selected for this experiment. Permission was obtained to administer this questionnaire to the group during the period 5-6 May 1949. All personnel not actually on watch at 1130 of 5 May 1949 were told to report to the library of the N.O.B. for administration of the questionnaire. After the group was assembled the purpose of the project was explained to them; how their frank opinions were necessary for the project to be meaningful; how they could write about the things that have been troubling them without fear of their supervisor finding out what had been written about him; how no identifying marks were to be

placed upon the questionnaire, nor were they to write the name of anyone else on the questionnaire; and how it might be possible in the future to obtain better understanding between the various groups. They were instructed how to fill out the questionnaire. In addition several needed individual instruction. It was pointed out that there were no right or wrong answers; therefore, no reason to look upon the next man's paper. It was reemphasized that only their own frank opinions were wanted, and particular stress was placed upon Question 8. There was no time limit. The completed questionnaires were collected at the door as they left.

At 1330 on 6 May those who had not taken the questionnaire the previous day were assembled in the library. The procedure was the same as the previous day.

On 7 May two men who had recently put in "quit-chits" and had applied for Army duty were visiting their friends at the P.O.W. They came down to the room and requested that they be permitted to take the "test." They were given the test.

Three questionnaires were rejected due to incomplete filling out. There were a total of twenty-five acceptable questionnaires. Several of the men were on leave; some did not take the test either at the scheduled times. However, there was a seventy-six per cent sample of the population.

Section V

FACTUAL PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

In order to determine the reliability of the instrument used, three possible methods were available. These were: (a) split-half method; (b) test-retest method; and (c) alternate form method. The split-half method was used. The group used was the standardizing group.

The first step in this method was to score the questionnaire. Each opinion question had a five choice selection, and each selection had a possible score value of one to five, arranged from unfavorable to favorable. The lowest possible total score for a person marking the more unfavorable responses was forty; the highest score, two hundred.

The answers to all the questions, except numbers XI and XV, were arranged such that response number one was the most unfavorable response, and response five the most favorable response. In the case of these exceptions it was necessary to adjust the score by assigning choice number one (the more favorable response in these two cases) a score value of five; choice two (a favorable response) a score value of four, etc. These changes were made on each completed questionnaire prior to punching the I.B.M. cards.

The scores for all the odd-numbered questions were totaled. Then the scores for all the even-numbered questions were totaled. Finally, as a check, the score for the whole test was totaled and compared with the sum of the odd-even scores.

The next step was to determine the reliability of the instrument from the data of the odd-even scores. This was done by the product-moment method (17). A reliability of .3028 was obtained. By use of the Spearman-Brown formula (17) the corrected reliability for the whole test was found to be .3428, or .85 reliability. It must be borne in mind that this seemingly high reliability is caused in part by the standardizing groups, and not by the internal consistency of the data comprising the instrument alone. However, this is a more than satisfactory reliability for the purpose of this study.

Upon determining that the instrument used was reliable, it was next possible to study the results obtained. As mentioned before, the first part of the questionnaire (Questions A-H) was devised to obtain status information from each of the subjects in each group.

The marital status of the subjects of each of these groups is shown in Table X (p. [illegible]). In Group I slightly more than eighty-seven per cent of the subjects are married. This group has the largest percentage of married personnel. In Group II over seventy-three per cent of the women are single. In Group III over sixty-six per cent of the men are married. In Group IV over fifty-three per cent of the women are single. It is to be noted that in both groups of male subjects, the larger percentage is among the married group, whereas in both groups of women workers the larger percentage is among the single group. In Group V over eighty-six per cent of the enlisted Waves are single. In Group VI fifty-two per cent of the subjects were single and forty-eight per cent of them married. (Question A).

The data from Question B is presented in Table II (p. [illegible]). It is to be noted that the mean age of the male subjects of Groups I and III is 20 and 22 years respectively. The youngest mean age group is found in Group II, with a mean age of 18. Group IV has a mean age of 22. The Waves show a mean age of 20 in Group V, and the mean age of the Group VI subjects is 24 years.

The length of service possessed by each person in the six groups is tabulated in Table III (p. [illegible]). The male civilians in Groups I and III have the most mean seniority, with 7 1/2 and 6 3/4 years respectively. The women in Group II have the least mean seniority with 3 years service. Next the women in Group IV, with 4 years mean service. The mean years of service for both the Waves and the male enlisted personnel in Group VI was 3 years 7 months.

The length of time that these people have been on their present jobs is shown in Table IV (p. [illegible]). The average time Groups I-VI have spent on the job is as follows: 1 year 6 months; 1 year 2 months; 1 year 6 months; 1 year 7 months; 1 year 5 months; and 1 year 7 months, respectively.

Question E was to give the writer the necessary information as to who the immediate supervisor of the subjects was. In the first group one of the employees had a Naval Officer as his immediate supervisor; thirteen had male civilians as their supervisors; and two had female civilians as their supervisor. Among the employees in Group II, again one had a Naval Officer as her immediate supervisor; nine had male civilians as their supervisors; and five had female civilians as their immediate supervisors. In Group III it was found

TABLE I

MARITAL STATUS OF SUBJECTS COMPRISING GROUPS I-VI

	Group I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Male, civilian, married	14	0	10	0	0	0	24
Male, civilian, single	2	0	5	0	0	0	7
Female, civilian, married	0	4	0	7	0	0	11
Female, civilian, single	0	11	0	8	0	0	19
Female, enlisted, married	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Female, enlisted, single	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
Male, enlisted, married	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Male, enlisted, single	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Total	16	15	15	15	15	26	101

TABLE II

AGES OF SUBJECTS OF GROUPS I-VI

	Group I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Under 20	0	7	5	4	0	4	18
20 - Under 25	4	8	0	3	2	14	26
25 - Under 30	5	1	8	6	10	6	36
30 - Under 35	2	1	6	0	1	1	12
35 - Under 40	2	2	0	0	1	0	5
40 - Under 45	0	0	2	2	1	1	6
45 - Under 50	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Over 50	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Total	16	15	15	15	15	26	101

TABLE III

TOTAL SERVICE OF SUBJECTS OF GROUPS I - VI

	Group I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Less than 6 months	0	1	1	0	2	0	4
6 months - less 1 year	1	3	0	1	3	0	8
1 year - less 5 years	3	6	3	3	3	7	26
5 years - less 10 years	8	5	8	10	11	9	42
10 years - less 15 years	3	0	3	1	3	9	21
15 years - less 20 years	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
More than 20 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	16	15	15	15	15	26	101

that thirteen of the male employees had male civilians as their immediate supervisor and two of them had female civilians as their supervisor. Group IV gave us the following breakdowns four had a Naval Officer as his supervisor; ten had a male civilian as his supervisor; and only one had a woman supervisor. Among the Wave personnel five of the subjects had a male Naval Officer as her supervisor; one had a male civilian supervisor; two, a female civilian supervisor; and seven had male enlisted supervisors. Among the subjects in Group VI it was noted that one was supervised by a Naval Officer and twenty-four were supervised by other male enlisted personnel.

As Question E was to determine who was the supervisor of each of the subjects, so Question F was devised to determine whether the subject was a supervisor or a non-supervisor; and if a supervisor, to determine the type personnel he or she supervised. In Group I we had seven supervisors and nine non-supervisors. The supervisory group had jurisdiction over civilians, male and female. In Group II we have only two supervisors, having jurisdiction over civilians, male and female, and thirteen in the non-supervisory group. We found four supervisors and eleven non-supervisors among Group III personnel. These male supervisors had supervision over both male and female civilians. There was but one woman supervisor in Group IV who supervised both male and female civilian personnel, and fourteen non-supervisors. There were three Waves having supervision over male enlisted personnel and twelve in the non-supervisor category. Among

the B.O.C. personnel there were four petty officers who had supervision over male enlisted personnel, and twenty-one who exercised no supervision.

It was the purpose of Questions G and H to get the subject's general impression of those who supervised him, and of those whom he supervised, if such was the case. This data in Question G was plotted against the morale scores on the whole test for each individual, and there was found to be slight positive correlation between their total score and their opinion of their immediate supervisor. The data of Question G is presented in Table V (p. 22).

In Table VI the data of Question H is presented. Again there was slight positive correlation between the total score and the opinion by the supervisors of the personnel they supervised.

The average morale scores for supervisors and non-supervisors is presented in Table VII (p. 25). In each group it should be noted that the average morale score for the supervisory group is at least nine or more points higher than the non-supervisory group. The greatest difference between morale scores of the supervisory and non-supervisory group is to be found among the enlisted Navy of Group V. Here the difference is 11.6 points.

Table VIII (p. 28) presents the average morale scores for the subgroups of the non-supervisory personnel. For those having a Navy Officer as the supervisor, the female civilians of Department "B" had the highest average morale score, whereas the female civilians of Department "A" had the lowest average morale score. For those

TABLE IV

TIME ON PRESENT JOB

Groups	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Less than 6 months	4	4	2	6	2	6	24
6 months - less 1 year	6	8	6	3	6	7	36
1 year - less 5 years	8	3	7	6	5	6	35
More than 5 years	2	2	2	2	2	1	11
Total	16	15	15	16	15	20	106

TABLE V

OPINION OF THEIR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISORS

Groups	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Excellent	5	1	4	6	3	1	20
Very good	4	5	6	7	4	1	27
Good	5	6	5	3	1	7	24
Fair	4	1	1	0	2	10	18
Poor	0	2	1	1	5	2	11
Total	16	15	15	16	15	20	106

TABLE VI

OPINION OF THE EXPERIENCE GROUP
OF THEIR NEW UNIT SUPERVISOR

Groups	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Excellent	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Very good	3	1	1	1	1	1	8
Good	2	1	2	0	1	1	8
Fair	2	0	0	0	1	1	4
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge no supervision	7	13	11	14	12	17	74
Total	14	15	15	15	15	20	104

having a civilian male supervisor, the women of both departments had higher average morale scores than did the male civilians of the same departments. The lowest score was had by an enlisted Wave, but as that was an individual score and not an average score from the test group we must caution our inferences. For those having female civilian supervisors, again the female civilians in both departments had higher average morale scores than the men of Department "B". There were no men from Department "A" having female supervisors. The lowest average score again went to the groups of enlisted Waves having female civilian supervisors.

In Table IX (p. 25) is presented the ranges of morale scores for each group, the median morale scores, and the interquartile range. The female civilians had highest median morale score with those from Department "B" higher than Department "A". The men of Department "B" had higher median morale scores than did the men of Department "A". The Wave enlisted personnel had higher median scores than did the Negro and Filipino enlisted personnel with a difference of 12 points. However, there was a difference of 16 median points between the enlisted Waves and the lowest group of civilian scores.

By use of absolute scores (median morale score divided by 40) it is possible to see how each group fits on the scale of one to five. This gives the average position on the scale that the individuals would answer each question. The highest group was among the female civilians of Department "B" (Group IV). This group approached

TABLE VII

AVERAGE MORALE SCORES OF
SUPERVISORS AND NON-SUPERVISORS

	Group I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total Average Score
Supervisor	147	142.8	150.6	177	178	142.8	1[illegible].3
Non-supervisor	138	150	141.[illegible]	167.2	114.[illegible]	138.7	1[illegible].3

TABLE VIII

AVERAGE MORALE SCORES OF
NON-SUPERVISORS HAVING VARIOUS TYPES OF SUPERVISORS

Having supervisor who is:	Group I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Navy Officer	146	138		181	144.8	
Navy Officer					138	
Civilian-male	148	150	145.6	156.4	78*	
Civilian-female		158	147.6*	188*	107.5	
Enlisted Navy					170.8	
Enlisted Man					88*	110.7

*only two or less cases

TABLE IX

RANGE, MEDIAN, ABSOLUTE, AND INTERQUARTILE
RANGE OF MORALE SCORES

	Group I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Range	127-188	120-172	84-181	114-188	74-183	74-154
Median Morale Score	146	152	150	139	130	118
Absolute (Mad-AD)	5.[illegible]	5.8	5.8	5.81	5.16	4.[illegible]
Interquartile Range	10.80	6.[illegible]	17.[illegible]	18.[illegible]	27.[illegible]	14.[illegible]

the favorable responses to each question. The lowest absolute score, 2.35, among the subjects of Group VI approached the neutral position, but remained in the unfavorable response position.

The largest interquartile range was among the subjects of Group IV, with 57, the smallest interquartile range was among the female civilians of Department "A" (Group II).

The following results were obtained from Questions 1-60, inclusive. The information showing frequency of responses and percentages of favorable and unfavorable responses are to be found in Tables I-XIII.

The chi-square test (17) was applied to many of the frequencies of responses to determine whether or not the responses could have been caused other than by chance in a significant degree. Due to the small N in each group the element of chance was an important factor to consider. But as a pattern of unfavorable, favorable responses was wanted it was found advisable to use simpler statistical analysis. Therefore, percentage of unfavorable responses (responses 1 and 2) and percentage of favorable responses (responses 4 and 5) are shown in each table. It was not necessary to show the percentage of the neutral response, as only the unfavorable or favorable pattern in the groups and between the groups was sought.

It is significant that the percentage of the best groups giving favorable responses (e.g. responses 4 and 5) to Question 1 belongs to the civilian workers. The enlisted men were equally divided between their favorable and unfavorable responses. The personnel comprising Group VI were more unfavorable in their responses to

the question as to whether they felt their supervisor took the credit while they did the work. (Table X).

In regard to the workers feeling that their supervisors kept their promises the workers of Department "B" had a higher percentage of favorable responses than those in Department "A". The enlisted Navy were more favorable (by 12.5 per cent)than unfavorable in their response. The Negro and Filipino personnel were unfavorable in their response to this question. (Table XI).

All the personnel were more favorable than unfavorable in their opinion that their supervisor was fair and impartial. The civilians as a group were definitely more favorable by a higher percentage than were the Navy personnel. Again the lowest percentage went to the Group VI personnel. (Table XII).

When asked how they felt in regard to their supervisor making prompt decisions the Group VI personnel again were the only group making a larger percentage of unfavorable comments. The lower percentages of favorable comments were made by the subjects of Groups II and IV--the female civilians of Departments "A" and "B". (Table XIII).

Table XIV presents the responses to the opinion as to whether or not the subjects feel that their supervisor considers the welfare of those who work for him. The highest percentage of favorable opinions was held by the female civilians of both departments--and those in Department "B" had 100 per cent favorable in their comments. The Navy presented the lowest percentage of favorable comments. The subjects of Group VI were the only group presenting a greater percentage of unfavorable comments.

TABLE X

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1:
Do you feel that you do the work and that your supervisor takes the credit?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	2	10	8		0	6.25	62.5	26.25
II		8	6	6		0	0.00	35.33	35.33
III	3	1	4	7		0	20.00	26.67	46.67
IV	2	2	1	10		0	13.33	6.67	66.33
V	3	3	2	1	6	20	20.00	6.67	53.33
VI	7	5	2	6	5	46	33.33	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE XI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 2:
How your supervisor has his problem?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	1	2	8	4	6.25	6.25	50.00	25.00
II			2	9	4	0.00	0.00	60.00	26.67
III			1	8	6	0.00	0.00	53.33	40.00
IV			1	5	9	0.00	0.00	33.33	60.00
V	2	3	3	4	3	13.33	20.00	26.67	20.00
VI	8	5	4	4	4	53.33	33.33	26.33	26.33

TABLE XII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 3:
Is your supervisor fair and impartial?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			2	15	2	0.00	0.00	76.00	10.00
II		2	1	8	4	0.00	16.33	53.33	26.67
III			3	7	5	0.00	0.00	46.67	53.33
IV			1	1	12	0.00	0.00	6.67	93.33
V	1	4	3	4	3	6.67	26.67	26.33	20.00
VI	5	3	10	4	3	33.00	12.00	16.00	19.00

TABLE XIII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 4:
Does your supervisor make prompt decisions?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		2	7	7		0.00	12.50	43.75	43.75
II	3	1	3	6		20.00	6.67	40.00	0.00
III		2	4	8	1	0.00	13.33	53.33	~~26.67~~ 6.67
IV	1	3	3	3	5	6.67	20.00	20.00	33.33
V		3	2	8	2	0.00	0.00	53.33	13.33
VI	2	3	3	7	3	13.33	20.00	13.33	20.00

When asked whether or not they felt that their supervisor was easy to approach on work problems, all groups were more favorable than unfavorable except the Group VI subjects. The female civilians of Department "B" were 100 per cent favorable in their response to this question. (Table XV).

As to whether or not they felt that their supervisor was easy to approach on personal problems, the subjects in Groups V and VI were more unfavorable in their responses. The male civilians of Department "B" were most favorable. (Table XVI).

The workers of Groups I-III felt that their supervisor took a personal interest in them either most or all of the time, whereas those in Groups IV-VI felt that their supervisor neglected to do this. (Table XVII).

The Waves and the Negro enlisted men felt that their supervisors used either poor or only fair methods in pointing out mistakes. All of the civilian groups felt that their supervisors used satisfactory methods to a greater extent than unsatisfactory methods. The female civilians of Department "B" seemed most satisfied. (Table XVIII).

Only the Negro personnel felt that their supervisor was too personal. The rest of the subjects in the Groups I-IV did not display any unfavorable opinion on this question, and the majority of the Waves were favorable in their responses. (Table XIX).

When asked if their supervisor gave them the necessary information about important plans and results that concerned them and their work the majority of the personnel of Group VI responded that their supervisors never did or not often. The majority of the other

TABLE XIV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 6:
Do you feel that your supervisor considers the welfare of those who work under him?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		1	2	6	6	0.00	4.25	17.0	25.50
II			1	7	7	0.00	0.00	46.67	46.67
III			4	5	6	0.00	0.00	33.33	40.00
IV				5	15	0.00	0.00	20.00	80.00
V	3	2	2	6	3	20.00	6.67	40.00	20.00
VI	3	3	3	3	3	16.00	20.00	11.00	9.00

TABLE XV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 8:
Do you feel that your supervisor is easy to approach on work problems?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			4	3	9	0.00	0.00	11.75	34.25
II		1	3	4	7	0.00	6.67	26.67	46.67
III		2		2	11	0.00	13.33	13.33	73.33
IV				2	13	0.00	0.00	13.33	86.67
V	2	3	4		6	13.33	20.00	0.00	40.00
VI	8	4	6	3	4	33.00	19.00	13.00	16.00

TABLE XVI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 7:
Is your supervisor easy to approach on personal problems?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		1	5	6	6	0.00	6.25	37.50	37.50
II		1	5	3	6	0.00	6.67	20.00	40.00
III		1	2	4	8	0.00	6.67	26.67	53.33
IV		2		3	10	0.00	13.33	20.00	66.67
V	6	1	2	1	5	40.00	6.67	6.67	33.33
VI	5	4	6	2	6	32.00	16.00	[illegible]	24.00

TABLE XVII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 8:
Does your supervisor take a personal interest in you?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		4	6	5	1	0.00	26.00	33.33	6.33
II	1	1	7	2	5	6.67	6.67	13.33	33.33
III		4	4	3	4	0.00	26.67	[illegible]	[illegible]
IV	2	5	2	1	4	13.33	33.33	6.67	[illegible]
V	7		2	2	4	46.67	0.00	13.33	26.67
VI	9	3	2	3	6	36.00	20.00	12.00	24.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE XVIII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 9:
Do you feel that the methods employed by your supervisor in pointing out mistakes are:

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	2		5	5	1	16.50	0.00	41.25	8.25
II	1		8	8	1	8.67	0.00	53.33	6.67
III	5	1	3	5	1	16.67	6.67	33.33	6.67
IV		1	3	5	6	0.00	6.67	33.33	40.00
V	6	1	2	3	3	40.00	6.67	20.00	20.00
VI	12	4	4	4	1	48.00	16.00	16.00	4.00

TABLE XIX
DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 10:
Do you feel that your supervisor is too personal?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			1	6	7	0.00	0.00	50.00	43.75
II				4	11	0.00	0.00	26.67	73.33
III			2	2	11	0.00	0.00	13.33	73.33
IV				1	14	0.00	0.00	6.67	93.33
V	1	1	2	4	8	6.67	6.67	13.33	53.33
VI	7	4	5	2	4	28.00	16.00	8.00	16.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

groups responded favorably, but it is to be noted that every group felt that at some time or other their supervisors fell short in this area. (Table XX).

The majority of the personnel of Group VI felt that their supervisor did not often forewarn them about changes that affected them. The Waves were evenly split—forty per cent feeling that their supervisor did not often forewarn them, and forty per cent feeling that most of the time they were forewarned. All of the civilians felt that most of the time they were forewarned of changes that affected them, but in every group there were those who felt this area was neglected by their supervisor at times. (Table XXI).

When asked how their supervisor compared with other supervisors of their acquaintance it was noted that the workers in Department "B" responded more favorably than the workers in the other groups. The majority of the Waves and the enlisted men of Group VI only rated their supervisors poor or fair. (Table XXII).

The majority of the workers in Groups I, II, IV and V did not feel that they were criticized by their supervisor very often when they did a poor job. The majority of the workers in Groups III and VI felt that they were criticized most of the time. (Table XXIII).

The majority of each group felt that they were not able to put things over on their supervisor. Less than ten per cent felt that they were able to put things over on the supervisor most of the time. (Table XXIV).

Sixty-four per cent of the Negro enlisted personnel in Group VI felt that their supervisor was waiting for them to step out of line most

TABLE XX

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 11:
Does your supervisor give you the necessary information about important plans and results which concern you and your work?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	3	2	7	3	6.25	18.75	43.75	18.75
II		2	3	2	7	0.00	13.33	20.00	46.67
III		2	3	6	2	0.00	13.33	53.33	13.33
IV		1	1	6	7	0.00	6.67	40.00	46.67
V	3	2	2	2	6	20.00	20.00	13.33	40.00
VI	9	6	3	3	4	36.00	24.00	12.00	16.00

TABLE XXI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 12:
Does your supervisor forewarn you about changes that will affect you?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		3	3	7	1	0.00	18.75	43.75	6.25
II		2	2	3	7	0.00	13.33	20.00	46.67
III	2		4	7	2	13.33	0.00	46.67	13.33
IV		2	2	5	6	0.00	13.33	33.33	40.00
V	2	4	3	3	3	13.33	26.67	20.00	20.00
VI	12	3	2	3	5	40.00	10.00	10.00	16.00

TABLE XXXI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 13:
How do you feel that your supervisor compares
with other supervisors of your acquaintance?
In comparison he is:

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	2	4	6	5	6.25	12.50	37.50	18.75
II		1	6	5	2	0.00	6.67	33.33	13.33
III	1	2	1	5	6	6.67	13.33	33.33	40.00
IV		1	1	3	10	0.00	6.67	20.00	66.67
V	4	4	2	3	2	26.67	26.67	20.00	13.33
VI	10	7	3	3	2	40.00	28.00	12.00	8.00

TABLE XXXII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 14:
Are you criticized by your supervisor when you
do a poor job?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		2	4	6	3	0.00	12.50	37.50	18.75
II		3	4	3	5	0.00	20.00	20.00	33.33
III	4	6	2	1	3	26.67	33.33	6.67	20.00
IV			3	5	7	0.00	0.00	20.00	46.67
V	1	1	4	6	3	6.67	6.67	40.00	20.00
VI	8	5	3	4	3	32.00	20.00	16.00	12.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE XIV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 16:
Do you feel that you are able to get things over on your supervisor?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			2	7	7	0.00	0.00	45.75	47.75
II				9	6	0.00	0.00	60.00	40.00
III	1		4	5	7	6.67	3.33	33.33	46.67
IV	1	1	1	6	9	6.67	6.67	40.00	60.00
V		1	5	5	8	0.00	6.67	33.33	40.00
VI		1	5	6	13	0.00	4.00	24.00	52.00

TABLE XV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 16:
Do you feel that your supervisor is waiting for you to step out of line?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1			5	10	3.33	0.00	33.33	66.33
II				1	14	0.00	0.00	6.67	93.33
III	2		1	3	13	13.33	0.00	20.00	86.67
IV	1		3		11	6.67	0.00	0.00	73.33
V	1	2	1	1	10	6.67	13.33	6.67	66.67
VI	11	5	3	2	4	44.00	20.00	8.00	16.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

of the time. In comparison twenty per cent or less of the subjects comprising the other groups felt that their supervisor was waiting for them to step out of line most of the time. One hundred per cent of the female civilians of Department "A" felt that their supervisor either never did or not often. (Table XXV).

A decided majority of the subjects in Groups I-IV felt that their supervisor fairly assigned the unpleasant tasks. A bare majority of the Group VI subjects felt this way too. It was the majority of the enlisted Waves who felt that their supervisor did not fairly assign the unpleasant tasks. This source of conflict was frequently mentioned by the Waves in their comments. See Appendix C for some comments. (Table XXVI).

A decided majority of all the subjects in Groups I, II, III, IV, and VI, and a bare majority in Group V, disapproved of anyone in the group taking advantage of the supervisor. (Table XXVII).

Only a majority of Group VI subjects felt that most of the time did their supervisor allow other persons in the section to get away with the same things that they would not be allowed to get away with. The civilians felt more highly of their supervisor on this point than did the Navy personnel--Waves and Negro enlisted. (Table XXVIII).

To the question: "Does your supervisor give you the proper backing up when you are in the right?" the majority of the civilians felt that their supervisors did most of the time. Group VI personnel were almost evenly divided in their opinions to this question, with a bare majority expressing an unfavorable opinion to this question. (Table XXIX).

TABLE XXVI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 17:

Does your supervisor fairly assign the unpleasant tasks?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	1	3	8	3	6.25	6.25	50.00	18.75
II	3	2	2	6	8	20.00	13.33	13.33	53.00
III	1		1	8	7	6.67	3.00	40.00	46.67
IV	2			5	8	12.50	0.00	31.25	50.25
V	5	2	2	2	4	33.33	13.33	13.33	26.67
VI	6	4	3	5	7	24.00	16.00	20.00	28.00

TABLE XXVII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 18:
How do you feel towards any person in your section
who takes advantage of your supervisor?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			2	5	6	0.00	0.00	31.25	50.00
II			2	7	6	0.00	0.00	46.67	40.00
III	1			6	8	6.67	0.00	40.00	53.33
IV	1		6	4	4	6.67	0.00	26.67	26.67
V	2	2	6	1	4	13.33	13.33	6.67	26.67
VI	1	2	11	6	5	4.00	8.00	24.00	20.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The civilians as a group felt that their supervisors encouraged them to offer new ideas and suggestions to a greater extent than did the service personnel. The majority of the Navy felt that their supervisors encouraged them along this line all the time. Over twenty-five per cent felt that their supervisors did not encourage them to offer new ideas or suggestions most of the time. Group VI were sixty-four per cent unfavorable as compared to sixteen per cent favorable in their comment of their supervisor. (Table XXX).

The majority of the subjects of Groups I-V felt that they and the others in their groups received praise or recognition for a job well done. A bare majority of 6.67 per cent, or just one man in the group of male civilians of Department "C" among a net favorable opinion of the supervisors along this line. As usual the Negro and Filipino subjects made a majority unfavorable opinion. (Table XXXI).

To the query "Do you feel that you are hampered in your work by your supervisor?" the most unfavorable responses were made by the personnel of Group VI. The female civilians of the two departments (Groups II and IV) felt that they were never or not often hampered by their supervisors. The Group IV personnel were 100 per cent favorable in their response. The male civilians in both departments were more favorable than the Navy of Group V. (Table XXXII).

The range of civilians making favorable responses to the inquiry "Does your supervisor give conflicting or contradictory orders?" was between sixty and eighty per cent. Again the enlisted Navy made a 46.67 per cent favorable response. The majority of the personnel of Group VI were unfavorable. (Table XXXIII).

TABLE XXX

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 21:
Does your supervisor encourage you to offer new ideas and suggestions?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		5		6	7	0.00	18.75	37.50	43.75
II	2		4	2	7	13.33	0.00	13.33	46.67
III	3		3	2	7	20.00	0.00	13.33	46.67
IV	1	2	1	2	9	6.67	13.33	13.33	60.00
V	3	1	4		7	20.00	6.67	0.00	46.67
VI	12	4	5	1	3	48.00	16.00	4.00	12.00

TABLE XXXI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 22:
Do you feel that you or others in your group receive praise or recognition for a job well done?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	2	3	2	6	3	12.50	18.75	37.50	18.75
II	1	1	4	7	2	6.67	6.67	46.67	13.33
III	2	3	4	3	1	13.33	20.00	23.33	6.67
IV		2	2	8	3	0.00	13.33	53.33	20.00
V	2	2	3	2	4	13.33	13.33	13.33	26.67
VI	6	7	5	1	6	24.00	28.00	4.00	24.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE XXXII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 22:
Do you feel that you are hampered in your work by your supervisor?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			5	6	8	0.00	0.00	37.50	51.25
II		1	1	6	7	3.33	6.67	40.00	46.67
III		2	2	2	9	0.00	13.33	13.33	60.00
IV				5	10	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67
V	1	2	4	2	5	6.67	13.33	13.33	33.33
VI	8	5	4	3	5	53.33	33.33	20.00	33.33

TABLE XXXIII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 24:
Does your supervisor give conflicting or contradictory orders?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			5	7	4	0.00	0.00	43.75	25.00
II		2	4	4	5	0.00	13.33	26.67	33.33
III		2	3	6	4	0.00	13.33	40.00	26.67
IV		1	2	3	9	0.00	6.67	20.00	60.00
V		3	3	4	3	0.00	20.00	26.67	20.00
VI	7	3	7	4	4	46.67	13.33	26.67	26.67

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

The majority of all the personnel in this investigation, except the enlisted Waves, felt that they had an opportunity in their job situation to show their supervisor how well they could perform their job. (Table XXXIV).

The majority of civilians, male and female, in Department "A" together with a majority of the subjects of Groups V and VI did not feel that promotions were going to the best qualified workers. Only the majority of the workers in Department "B" were favorable in their response to this question. (Table XXXV).

The majority of all the subjects felt that their supervisors were consistent in the standard of work performance required. (Table XXXVI).

The civilians felt that their supervisors were popular with the other supervisors, whereas the majority of the service personnel felt that their supervisors were slightly less popular than average. (Table XXXVII).

The same pattern of responses appeared when the subjects were asked "How popular is your supervisor with the other workers in the group?" The majority of the civilians felt that their supervisors had average popularity or more, whereas the service personnel felt that their supervisors were less popular than average with the workers. ("Table XXXVIII).

When asked how they thought they compared with the other workers in their section, the majority in each group considered themselves in their opinion as about average. Some of the workers in Department "A" considered themselves below average. Of the male civilians in

TABLE XXXIV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 25:
Do you feel that you have an opportunity in your job situation to show your supervisor how well you can perform your job?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	3	1	2	5	3	18.75	6.25	31.25	31.25
II		3	2	4	6	0.00	20.00	26.67	40.00
III	1	3	2	6	3	6.67	20.00	40.00	33.00
IV		1	2	7	5	0.00	6.67	46.67	33.33
V	5	2	1	5	1	33.33	13.33	33.33	6.67
VI	3	1	3	4	10	20.00	4.00	16.00	40.00

TABLE XXXV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 26:
Do you feel that promotions are going to the best qualified workers?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	4	7	1	3	1	25.00	43.75	18.75	6.25
II	1	6	4	3	1	6.67	40.00	20.00	6.67
III	1	2	3	7		6.67	13.33	46.67	0.00
IV	2	2	3	4	2	13.33	13.33	26.67	13.33
V	2	6	3	2	2	13.33	40.00	13.33	13.33
VI	4	8	3	3	7	16.00	32.00	12.00	28.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TABLE XXXVI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 27:
Do you feel that your supervisor is consistent in the standard of work performance that he requires?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	2	3	9	1	6.25	12.50	56.25	6.25
II	1	1	2	9	2	6.67	6.67	60.00	13.33
III	1	1	1	9	3	6.67	6.67	60.00	20.00
IV		1	2	5	7	0.00	6.67	33.33	46.67
V	3	3	1	1	7	20.00	20.00	6.67	46.67
VI	5	2	5	5	7	20.00	13.00	20.00	28.00

TABLE XXXVII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 28:
How popular is your supervisor with other supervisors?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		1	12		3	0.00	6.25	0.00	18.75
II	1		9	2	3	6.67	0.00	13.33	20.00
III		3	6	3	4	0.00	20.00	20.00	26.67
IV		1	5	3	6	0.00	6.67	20.00	40.00
V	5	1	6		2	33.33	6.67	0.00	13.33
VI	6	4	9		6	24.00	16.00	0.00	24.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE XXVIII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 29:
How popular is your supervisor with the other workers in the group?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	1	2	7	2	4	6.25	12.50	12.50	25.00
II		1	7	5	2	0.00	6.67	33.33	13.33
III		2	4	2	5	0.00	20.00	20.00	33.33
IV			4	2	9	0.00	0.00	13.33	60.00
V	2	1	5	2	2	33.33	6.67	13.33	13.33
VI	6	5	3		6	24.00	20.00	0.00	24.00

TABLE XXIX

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 30:
How do you think you compare with the other workers in your section?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			2	8	6	0.00	0.00	50.00	37.50
II			13	2		0.00	0.00	13.33	0.00
III		1	8	6		0.00	6.67	40.00	0.00
IV		1	10	3	1	0.00	6.67	20.00	6.67
V		1	8	4	2	0.00	6.67	26.67	13.33
VI	2	2	10	3	5	8.00	8.00	32.00	12.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Department "A", 57.5 per cent considered themselves better than average. The next highest group was the Negro enlisted men of Group VI, as forty-four per cent considered themselves above average. (Table XXXIX).

The decided majority of all workers in all groups felt that they knew what was expected of them on their job better than average. (Table XL).

The majority of the female civilians of Department "B" and the Wave enlisted personnel felt that their supervisors had provided training for them to an extent that they cannot handle other than their present job with difficulty. The other groups felt that they had been adequately trained by their supervisors. (Table XLI).

When asked "How do you think your supervisor compares you with the other workers in your section?" the majority in all groups felt that they were considered among the average group. None of the workers in Groups II, IV and V felt that they were considered below average. The male civilians in Department "A", to the extent of seventy-five per cent of the group, felt that they were considered above average. (Table XLII).

The largest percentage of the subjects of Groups I and VI responded that they felt resentment to Navy type discipline most of the time or more. The female civilians of Group II, as a group, felt the least resentment to Navy type discipline. (Table XLIII).

The majority of the male civilians of Department "A" (Group I) and the enlisted Waves of Group V felt that civilians resent being

TABLE XL

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 41:
I feel that I know what is expected of me in my job

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I			1	4	11	0.00	0.00	22.00	68.75
II	1		5	2	7	6.67	0.00	13.33	46.67
III		1		5	9	0.00	6.67	33.33	60.00
IV	2		2	2	8	13.33	0.00	13.33	53.33
V		2	1	3	9	0.00	13.33	20.00	60.00
VI	1	1	4	8	11	4.00	4.00	32.00	44.00

TABLE XLI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 38:
Do you feel that your supervisor has provided
training for you so that you can:

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	2	6	1	1	7	12.50	31.25	6.25	43.75
II	1	2	6	2	4	6.67	13.33	13.33	26.67
III	1	4	2	3	5	6.67	26.67	20.00	33.33
IV		6	6	1	2	0.00	40.00	6.67	13.33
V	1	5	4	1	4	6.67	33.33	6.67	26.67
VI	6	1	3	7	8	24.00	4.00	28.00	32.00

TABLE XLII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 32:
How do you think your supervisor compares you with the other workers in the section?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	2	2	3	9		0.00	11.50	18.75	56.25
II		11	2	2		0.00	0.00	6.67	6.67
III	1	1	8	4	1	6.67	6.67	26.67	6.67
IV		6	8	5	[illegible]	0.00	0.00	15.15	37.35
V		7	7	5		0.00	0.00	[illegible]	33.33
VI	6	11	3	6		0.00	55.00	11.00	34.00

TABLE XLIII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 34:
Do you feel resentment to Navy type discipline?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	4	5	4	5	2	25.00	18.75	18.75	12.50
II	1	1	1	6	4	6.67	6.67	53.33	26.67
III		2	6	1	6	0.00	13.33	6.67	40.00
IV	1	1	4	5	4	6.67	6.67	33.33	26.67
V			2	3	10	0.00	0.00	20.00	66.67
VI	8	2	5	5	5	38.00	11.00	25.00	11.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

orders from Navy personnel. None of the female civilians of Department "B" (Group IV) said they felt that civilians resent taking orders from Navy personnel. (Table XLIV).

The majority of the female civilians of both Departments "A" and "B" reported that they had no preference for either a male or female supervisor. However, there was a larger percentage in each of the six groups who disliked having a woman supervisor than those who liked having a woman supervisor. It is significant that 57.55 per cent of the enlisted Waves expressed a dislike for having a woman supervisor. (Table XLV).

The majority of all the subjects in each of the groups, except the Waves in Group V, expressed no preference for either a Wave or a civilian woman supervisor. None of the remainder expressed a dislike for having a Wave supervisor, except the Group VI personnel, who expressed a like for having a Wave supervisor. (Table XLVI).

To the question, "In general, do you feel that woman supervisors pay too much attention to petty details?" the majority of the workers from Department "B" expressed a neutral attitude, e.g. a response of "some of the time." The "most of the time" response was made by a majority of those from Groups I, V and VI. The "not often" response was made by a majority of Group II personnel. (Table XLVII).

When asked, "In general, do you feel that woman supervisors allow personalities to influence their decisions more than men?" the majority of Groups II and III expressed a "some of the time" response. A majority of the subjects of Groups I, V and VI expressed "most of the time" response. A majority of the female civilians in Group IV expressed the "not often" response. (Table XLVIII).

TABLE XLIV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 24:
Do you feel that civilians respect taking orders
from Navy personnel?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	2	4	4	4	1	18.75	35.00	25.00	6.25
II	1	1	4	6	2	6.67	6.67	40.00	13.33
III		1	7	6	1	0.00	6.67	40.00	6.67
IV			2	5	7	0.00	0.00	33.33	46.67
V	5	6	1	2	1	33.33	40.00	13.33	6.67
VI	6	5	6	5	5	24.00	12.00	24.00	24.00

TABLE XLV

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 25:
What are your feelings about working for enlisted supervisors?

Group	Response 1	2	3	4	5	% of Response Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	5	5	5	1		31.25	31.25	6.25	0.00
II	2	5	9		1	13.33	33.00	0.00	6.67
III	4	4	6	1		26.67	26.67	6.67	0.00
IV	6	1	7	1		40.00	6.67	6.67	0.00
V	11	2	1			73.33	13.00	0.00	0.00
VI	7	1	8	3	1	28.00	4.00	32.00	8.00

TABLE XLVI

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 37:
What are your feelings about working under a Navy Officer
in comparison with a civilian woman supervisor?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	8	8	6	1	1	37.50	14.50	6.25	6.25
II	1	3	10	1		6.67	20.00	6.67	0.00
III	6	1	6			40.00	6.67	0.00	0.00
IV	3	2	10			20.00	13.33	0.00	0.00
V	3	2	2	4	5	13.33	13.33	26.67	33.33
VI	4	3	10	4	4	16.00	12.00	16.00	16.00

TABLE XLVII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 38:
In general, do you feel that women supervisors
pay too much attention to petty details?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	4	6	5	1		25.00	37.50	6.25	0.00
II	1	4	4	5	1	6.67	26.67	33.33	6.67
III	2	2	7	4		13.33	13.33	26.67	0.00
IV	2	3	7	2	1	13.33	20.00	13.33	6.67
V	4	8	3			26.67	53.33	0.00	0.00
VI	8	3	3	4	3	32.00	20.00	16.00	12.00

TABLE XLVIII

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 30:
In general, do you feel that women supervisors
allow personalities to influence their decisions
more than men?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I	3	9	2	2		18.75	56.25	12.5	0.00
II		4	7	2	2	0.00	26.67	13.33	13.33
III	2		11	1	1	13.33	0.00	6.67	6.67
IV	2	3	5	2	3	13.33	20.00	13.33	20.00
V	5	6	2	2		33.33	40.00	13.33	0.00
VI	6	5	10	2	2	24.00	20.00	8.00	8.00

TABLE XLIX

DATA OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 40:
Do you feel that your supervisor does not like
to see you get too good on your job
or try to get ahead too fast?

Group	Responses 1	2	3	4	5	% of Responses Unfavorable 1	2	Favorable 4	5
I		2	2	3	8	0.00	12.50	18.75	50.00
II			2		13	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.67
III	1	3	2	1	8	6.67	18.18	6.67	53.33
IV			1	2	12	0.00	0.00	13.33	80.00
V	4		1	1	8	26.67	0.00	6.67	53.33
VI	9	1	3	3	3	36.00	4.00	12.00	12.00

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

A majority of the Group VI subjects felt that their supervisor does not like to see them get too good on their job or try to get ahead too fast. The majority of the other subjects did not feel this very often. (Table XLIX).

These latter questions support the conclusions of Laird (22).

The third and final part of the questionnaire consisted of Questions I-S, inclusive. By use of these open-end type questions an attempt was made to find out some specific likes and dislikes for Navy, civilian, male, and female type supervisors; also that the individuals felt was the best way to get along with their supervisors, and what suggestions, if heeded, would improve their supervisors. In the final question the subjects were given an opportunity to write about any subject that was causing their job or job situation to be less satisfying.

The responses to Questions I to S were categorized, and the typical comments of each category appear in Appendix C.

Section VI

INTERPRETATION

Supervisors as a group were consistently more favorable in their responses than their subordinates. In his study, Halstad (9, p. 51) found the same to be true.

The civilians as a group consistently were more favorable in their responses than the service personnel. They were under the supervision of Navy Officers or other civilians. From the answers in the open-end questions about likes/dislikes, it appeared that the civilians respected their Navy supervisors. They felt that they were impartial, that their dignity added force to the orders, that they were consistent in discipline. They felt that their civilian supervisors had the same problems as they did, were one of them, etc.

On the other hand, the Navy enlisted personnel had a variety of kinds of supervisors. Most of the Navy enlisted deep resentment towards civilian supervisors. Thus the difference between the dislikes of the civilians and the Navy appears one of degree. The Navy were intense in their dislike of civilians--but were especially of female civilian supervisors. This is shown in Table XIV.

The group with the most consistent unfavorable responses was the Negro and Filipino enlisted personnel of Group VI. The main resentment was centered on the Chief-in-charge. There appeared an intense dislike for this person. The feeling against this person was almost unanimous for the whole group. Perhaps if the methods

of Frustrandy (12) in his projective techniques were applied, or even by use of interview techniques, it would be possible to determine whether he was the natural object of their frustrations as a result of other unsatisfactory job situations or not. But the results of this experiment point out that the lowest morale group was Group VI, and that this group was consistent in their intense dislike for their supervisor.

The results of this study also pointed out that the women consistently were more intense in their dislike for a woman supervisor. In the open-end questions, when asked what they disliked about women supervisors, their responses supported the conclusions of Laird (22) when he listed the reasons women prefer men bosses. Not one expressed preference for a male supervisor.

The reasons listed by the groups in regard to dislikes of women supervisors supports in part the conclusions of Halsey (13, pp. 17-24). Halsey stated that the prejudices against women supervisors voiced by many men as well as women were: (1) women supervisors do not give sufficient credit to those who work for them; (2) women supervisors do not like to have those under them "get too good" or "try to get ahead too fast"; (3) women supervisors are too personal; (4) women supervisors are too fussy, particular, and prying; (5) women supervisors are often too skeptical of their women workers; and (6)"Working for a woman is not exciting enough; we like to have some men around." The comments made by the various groups support the first four of these statements; no mention was made of the prejudices expressed in (5) and (6) above.

An analysis of Question 5, which was designed to give each subject an opportunity to discuss his problems, points out that job situations are not satisfying unless each feels that his efforts are appreciated, that his supervisor and the management realize both the difficulty and the importance of what he is doing, that they do not in any way look down on him or his work even though his work may be of a routine character.

Brunkal (11) points out the function of a good supervisor. In building confidence he must keep promises; be fair and impartial; make prompt decisions; consider the welfare of others; and be an easy-to-talk-to person. He must develop initiative; prevent grievances; correct mistakes; develop understudies; and get cooperation. Many group pointed out certain of these areas that they felt lacking in their supervisors. It was found that the frequency of the number of felt shortcomings in the supervisor is in direct proportion to the intensity of dislike for the supervisor by the supervised personnel.

An important point to note is that the most frequent comment about likes-dislikes of various types of supervisors was that it did not make any difference whether the supervisor was Negro or civilian, male or female. The important thing was whether or not that supervisor employed good supervisory techniques. Although it was established that women supervisors in general did have certain tendencies, nevertheless it was up to the individual supervisor to overcome certain basic prejudices. A supervisor who satisfied the basic needs of those who he supervised was a good supervisor regardless of sex or type of service. Bolotsk (10, p. 112) states:

As far as the job is concerned, most persons want at least four things:

1. Security in his work
2. A feeling that he is accepted by the group he works with, that he "belongs" to it
3. Some recognition that his job is well done
4. An adequate opportunity to participate—that is, to do something his own way, to make suggestions, to feel that he is helping in the total achievement of the organization.

When a person feels that these demands are not being satisfied, feelings of personal inadequacy and dissatisfactions are likely to crop up.

Thus it is when these basic needs are not being satisfied that dissatisfactions because "my supervisor is a woman" or "a civilian" etc. rear their head. And any attempt to solve the resultant personnel problems in the areas of Navy supervising civilians, civilians supervising Navy personnel, Waves supervising men, etc. without taking into account the basic needs of the workers, will only be a partial solution. This experiment has attempted to set up an experimental design for investigating the areas of conflict between supervisors and non-supervisors between various groups. It appeared from the results that the areas of conflict were not as much due to differences in type of supervision, e.g. Navy or civilian, male or female, but were the result of the supervisory techniques employed by the supervisors.

The best method for administering a questionnaire of an experimental nature such as this was that employed with Groups I, II, and VI. With these groups it was possible to assemble the subjects in a separate room; to explain to them the nature of the project; how they happened to be the ones selected for the experiment; to reassure them that no attempt would be made to find out who had written any adverse

criticism. No difference was noted between the extent of completion of the questionnaires of Groups I and II, and Group VI due to the imposition of a time limit (thirty minutes) with the first two groups, and no time limit with Group VI.

The methods employed with Groups III and IV were imposed by circumstances over which there was no control. As there was no physical area where the test group could be assembled, and as it was not possible to explain the nature of the project in detail or dispel their natural suspicions, it was not too surprising that several left without returning their questionnaires. Even though these questionnaires were later returned via mail, the results with this group must be cautiously received.

Another possible source of error might have been the result of not having the answers randomly placed. As it was, an attempt was made to have the unfavorable through neutral to favorable responses in each question. Had the responses been randomly placed the possibility of a subject hurriedly checking off the sum of several positions on the scale would have been greatly reduced.

Further, the general questions concerning women supervisors, as found in Questions 33-40, could possibly raise the social masks of the individuals even though in their particular job situation they were not experiencing conflict with a woman supervisor. It is felt that these last items should be omitted from the instrument in the future.

This experimental device does point out areas where the supervisors are felt to be lacking by their supervised personnel. To locate the

specific weaknesses of individual supervisors, it would be best to have only the personnel supervised by that individual use the instrument. In this study various individuals in the same department rated various supervisors. Thereby it was possible to get a general picture of the areas of weaknesses within the department. It was not possible to get the specific weaknesses of specific supervisors. However, this critical device should not be used in any group unless it was the policy to use the data obtained as a means of training for the personnel rated--never as a rating of the personnel. No action against a supervisor should be taken except in training courses in supervisory techniques.

In addition to being a source of training for better supervision of the supervisory personnel, it was demonstrated that the instrument serves as a therapeutic device for the supervised personnel. As a result of talks with some of the subjects it was obvious that the groups as a whole felt better when given an opportunity to express their opinions about their supervisors' weaknesses and to further discuss other problems that might be bothering them. Many expressed the comment that they "felt so much better since I've gotten some of the things that have been bothering me off my chest." As an extreme case the personnel of Group VI came to look upon the investigator as someone who was going to help them, and as one interested in them and their problems. They looked upon the questionnaire as a device that might help to remove their unpopular supervisor. Although their consensus would be to replace the supervisor, it is the opinion

of the investigator that this supervisor should be trained in supervisory techniques. If he could obtain "leadership" in place of his present "friendship" the personnel of Group VI, I am sure, would admit that replacement was not the solution either. Whenever instruments such as the one devised in this study point out areas of conflict, instruction and training to remove the causes, rather than the individuals, seems to be the solution.

Section VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The field of interpersonal relations and supervisory methods was investigated, and from the information obtained a questionnaire was prepared which consisted of various problems in the realm of supervisor-non-supervisor relationships.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part consisted of status items, from which information about age, marital status, Navy/civilian, length of service, service on present job, etc. was obtained. The second part consisted of forty multiple choice items in the field of supervisor-non-supervisor relationships. There were five choices to each question, and as in the Likert technique, it was assumed that the interval between each was equal. The responses were arranged from unfavorable through neutral to favorable. The final part consisted of open-end questions, from which it was possible to obtain in part the "why" of some of the responses in the second part. The subjects were given an opportunity in this latter section to discuss likes/dislikes about Navy, civilian, male and female supervisors, and to discuss any problems that they had tending to make their job situation less satisfying.

The questionnaire was administered to two groups of male and two groups of female civilian personnel employed at a supply activity in the Ninth Naval District; to a group of Navy enlisted personnel; and finally to a group of Negro and Filipino enlisted personnel.

The reliability of the instrument was determined by the product-moment method, and as corrected by the Spearman Brown formula, was found to be .95.

The supervisors as a group rated higher on their morale scores than the non-supervisory personnel.

The civilians as a group rated higher than the service personnel.

The Negro and Filipino personnel rated lowest of any group.

The Navy recruited women supervisors were than any other group. They recruited civilian supervisors were than any other group.

The majority of the comments pointed out that it did not matter the service or sex of the supervisor as long as good supervisory techniques were used.

Although there was wide differences in morale scores between the various groups, there was also even a wide difference among the same group.

The instrument points out areas of shortcoming/conflicts felt by the individuals towards their immediate supervisors.

It is possible to quantitatively compare results between groups with this instrument. The use of common items permits a direct comparison between randomly selected groups.

No ill feeling was caused as a result of giving this questionnaire. Conversely, it appeared to have a therapeutic effect upon the groups to whom it was administered.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arthur, George, "A Survey of Attitudes of Navy Civil Service Personnel." Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, Northeastern University, June, 1947.

2. Bair, D. H., "A Review of Leadership." Psychological Bulletin, 41:1, , 476-7.

3. Barlow, F. E., Industrial Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1951.

4. Bingo, H. J., Standard Practice in Personnel Work. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1947.

5. Bingo, Dorothy J., How to Make a Morale Survey. Chicago: National Personnel Institute Inc., 1951.

6. Borgen, Harold D., "Finding Out What Employees are Thinking." The Conference Board Management Record. National Industrial Conference Board, 15:4, April, 1953, 87-92.

7. Borgen, Harold E. and Dean, Joel, "A Study of Employee Attitudes" (abstract). Personnel Bulletin, 24:7, July, 1952, 242.

8. Bilian, R. H. and Bilian, V. T., "Clinical Counseling in Vocational Guidance." Journal of Clinical Psychology, July, 1948, 164.

9. Blum, Milton L., Industrial Psychology and Its Social Foundations. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1949, Chap. I-IV, 1-21.

10. Boggs, Tom H. and Bowers, Louis L., "How to Conduct Employee Opinion Surveys." Employee Management and Relations, 104:5, March, 1949, 32-36.

11. Brandel, Charley H., Essentials of Management for Supervisors. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1947.

12. Campbell, J. W., "An Attitude Survey of a Typical Manufacturing Firm." Personnel Psychology, 3:1, Spring 1949, 81-89.

13. Chapple, E. D. and Wright, L. A., How to Interview People in Industry: A Guide for Supervisors on How to Interviews People and Control Their Behavior. New Haven, Conn.: National Personnel Institute, 1949, pp. 112-116.

14. Cole, R. J., "Survey of Employee Attitudes" (abstract). Management Methods, Vol, January 1941, 11-14.

15. Craig and Charters, Personal Leadership in Industry. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1921.

16. Dorl, S., Dimerstein, S., Harding, J. and Pearlman, A. S., "Techniques for the Diagnosis and Measurement of Intergroup Attitudes and Behavior." Psychological Bulletin, 45:1, May, 1948, 248-253.

17. Edwards, A. L., Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education. Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1946.

18. Edwards, A. L. and Kenny, K. C., "A Comparison of the Thurstone and Likert Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 30:1, January, 1946, 72-83.

19. "Employee Relations in the Public Service." A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly, Civil Service Assembly of the U. S. and Canada, Chicago, 1942, 1-73, 237-250.

20. Evans, J. J. Jr., "Supervisors Combat Attitude Survey." Personnel, 17:2, November, 1940, 141-150.

21. Gardner, B. B., "Human Relations in Industry" (Social Research, Inc., Chicago, Ill.) Int. Personnel Review, 8, 1947, 6-8.

22. French, J. R. P. Jr., Kornhauser, Arthur, and Marrow, Alfred (Editors), "Conflict and Cooperation in Industry." Journal of Social Issues, 3:1, 1947, 1-55.

23. Haley, G. H., Supervising People. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1951.

24. Hartman, G. W. and Newcomb, T., (Editors), Industrial Conflict: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Dryden Co., 1940.

25. Hosmer, H. H., Psychology Applied to Life and Work. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1951.

26. Hoyel, Carl, Human Relations Manual for Executives. New York and London: McGraw Hill, 1949.

27. Hoppock, R., Primer on Job Attitudes. Occupational Index, Inc., 1941

28. Hoppock, R., Job Satisfaction. New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1935.

29. Roulett, S. D. (Editor), Human Factors in Management. New York: Harper and Bros., 1944.

30. Rowser, J. R., What People Want from the Boss. New York and London: McGraw Hill, 1943.

31. Hunt, H. C., "Why People Lose Their Jobs or Aren't Promoted." Personnel Journal, 14:327, 28-36.

32. Irwin, J. N., "Sampling Worker's Opinions." Dun's Review, November, 1945, 32-37.

33. Selstad, Arthur, "Attitudes of Employees and their Supervisors." Personnel, January, 1944, 311-320.

34. Northouser, A. W., "Psychological Studies of Employee Attitudes." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 8:1, May-June, 1944, 137-143.

35. Laird, D. A., "The Psychology of Supervising the Working Woman." New York and London: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1942.

36. Meier, N. R. F., Psychology in Industry. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1946.

37. Mayo, E., The Industrial Problems of an Industrial Civilization. (2nd Edition). Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1946, 180-184.

38. Kelner, J., "Treatment of Inter-Personal Relations in Groups." Journal of Soc. Issues, 1:2, 1947, 29-34.

39. McNemar, Quinn, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology." Psychological Bulletin, 41:4, 1944, 289-309.

40. Overstreet, H. A., Influencing Human Behavior. New York: The Peoples Institute

41. "Personnel Administration and Personnel Training." Washington: Dept. of Agriculture, Government Printing Office.

42. Proshansky, H. M., "A Projective Method for the Study of Attitude." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 38, 1943, 393-395.

43. Reeves, F. W. and Davis, F. T., Personnel Administration in the Federal Service. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937, 30-33.

44. Riker, B. L., "A Comparison of Methods used in Attitude Research." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 39, 1944, 24-42.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

45. Roethlisberger, F. J. and Dickson, W. J., Management and the Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

46. Ryan, T. A., Work and Effort. New York: The Ronald Press, 1947.

47. Scott, W. D., Clothier, R. C., Mathewson, and Spriegel, W., Personnel Management. New York and London: McGraw Hill, 1941.

48. Seashore, Robert H., "Experimental Methods in Psychology." Unpublished, Northwestern University.

49. Stead, W. H., Shartle, C. L. and Associates, Occupational Counseling Techniques. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

50. Tead, Ordway, The Art of Leadership. New York: McGraw Hill, 1935.

51. Tead, Ordway, Human Nature and Management. New York: McGraw Hill, 1937.

52. Tead, Ordway and Metcalf, H. C., Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw Hill, 1933.

53. Thurstone, L. L., "Theory of Attitude Measurement." Psychological Review, 36:1929, 222-241.

54. Tiffin, J., Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1942.

55. Van Dusen, A. C., "Measuring Leadership Ability." Personnel Psychology, 1:1, Spring, 1948, 67-78.

56. Walters, J. E., Applied Personnel Administration. New York: Wiley and Sons.

57. Walters, J. E., Personnel Relations. New York: Ronald Press, 1945, Chap. XII, 283-285.

58. Woods, Walter, "Employee Attitudes and their Relations to Morale." Journal of Applied Psychology, 28:4, August, 1944, 283-291.

59. Yoder, Dale, Personnel Management and Industrial Relations. Prentice Hall, Inc., 1948.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

APPENDIX A

ATTITUDE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this research project is to attempt to bring to light those personal inter-relationships that cause frictions, misunderstandings, and which result in personnel problems and tensions between male and female, military and civilian personnel in supervisory and non-supervisory levels. By getting YOUR frank opinions about those conflicts within the organization within which you are now working, it is hoped that a way will be pointed towards facilitating better understanding between these different levels and types of supervision. Only by getting YOUR opinion concerning what bothers YOU in these relationships now, can it be hoped to improve these relationships later.

Other than YOUR OWN FRANK OPINIONS there are no right and wrong answers to the following questions. Do NOT place your name or any identifying marks upon the questionnaire.

****

A. My status is as follows (place circle around number of applicable answer):

1. Male, Officer, Married
2. Male, Officer, Single
3. Male, Civilian, Married
4. Male, Civilian, Single
5. Female, Civilian, Married
6. Female, Civilian, Single

B. My age is:

1. under 20
2. over 20 -- under 25
3. over 25 -- under 30
4. over 30 -- under 35
5. over 35 -- under 40
6. over 40 -- under 45
7. over 45 -- under 50
8. over 50

C. I have the following service:

1. less than 6 mos.
2. more than 6 mos-less than 1 year
3. more than 1 year-less than 5 years
4. more than 5 years-less than 10 years
5. more than 10 years-less than 15 years
6. more than 15 years-less than 20 years
7. more than 20 years

D. I have been on my present job:

1. less than 6 months
2. more than 6 months-less than 1 year
3. more than 1 year---less than 5 years
4. more than 5 years

E. My immediate supervisor is:

1. Male, Officer, Married
2. Male, Officer, Single
3. Male, Civilian, Married
4. Male, Civilian, Single
5. Female, Civilian, Married
6. Female, Civilian, Single

F. I have supervision over (check most appropriate category):

1. Officers
2. Officers, and Civilians (Male and Female)
3. Officers, and Civilians (Male)
4. Officers, and Civilians (Female)
5. Civilians, (Male and Female)
6. Civilians (Male)
7. Civilians (Female)
8. I exercise no supervision

G. My general impression of those who supervise me is:

1. excellent
2. very good
3. good
4. fair
5. poor

H. My general impression of those whom I supervise is:

1. excellent
2. very good
3. good
4. fair
5. poor

You are requested to answer the following questions by circling that answer which more closely approximates YOUR FEELINGS in each case.

1. Do you feel that you do the work and that your supervisor take the credit?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

2. Does your supervisor keep his promises?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

3. Is your supervisor fair and impartial?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

4. Does your supervisor make prompt decisions?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

5. Do you feel that your supervisor considers the welfare of those who work under him?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

6. Do you feel that your supervisor is easy to approach on work problems?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

7. Is your supervisor easy to approach on personal problems?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

8. Does your supervisor take a personal interest in you?
   1. never
   2. not often
   3. some of the time
   4. most of the time
   5. all the time

9. Do you feel that the methods employed by your supervisor in pointing out mistakesare:
   1. poor
   2. fair
   3. good
   4. very good
   5. excellent

10. Do you feel that your supervisor is too personal?
   1. all the time
   2. most of the time
   3. some of the time
   4. not often
   5. never

11. Does your supervisor give you the necessary information about important plans and results which concern you and your work?
   1. never
   2. not often
   3. some of the time
   4. most of the time
   5. all the time

12. Does your supervisor forewarn you about changes that will affect you?
   1. never
   2. not often
   3. some of the time
   4. most of the time
   5. all the time

13. How do you feel that your supervisor compares with other supervisors of your acquaintance? In comparison he is:
   1. poor
   2. fair
   3. good
   4. very good
   5. excellent

14. Are you criticized by your supervisor when you do a poor job?
   1. all the time
   2. most of the time
   3. some of the time
   4. not often
   5. never

15. Do you feel that you are able to put things over on your supervisor?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

16. Do you feel that your supervisor is waiting for you to step out of line?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

17. Does your supervisor fairly assign the unpleasant tasks?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

18. How do you feel towards any person in your section who takes advantage of your supervisor? I
    1. strongly approve
    2. approve
    3. neither approve or disapprove
    4. disapprove
    5. strongly disapprove

19. Do you feel that your supervisor allows other persons in the section to get away with the same things that he would not allow you to get away with?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

20. Does your supervisor give you the proper backing up when you are in the right?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

21. Does your supervisor encourage you to offer new ideas and suggestions?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

22. Do you feel that you or others in your group receive praise or recognition for a job well done?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

23. Do you feel that you are hampered in your work by your supervisor?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

24. Does your supervisor give conflicting or contradictory orders?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

25. Do you feel that you have an opportunity in your job situation to show your supervisor how well you can perform you job?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

26. Do you feel that promotions are going to the best qualified workers?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

27. Do you feel that your supervisor is consistent in the standard of work performance that he requires?
    1. never
    2. not often
    3. some of the time
    4. most of the time
    5. all the time

28 How popular is your supervisor with other supervisors?
    1. unpopular
    2. slightly less popular than average
    3. average popularity
    4. slightly more popular than average
    5. very popular

29. How popular is your supervisor with the other workers in the group?
    1. unpopular
    2. slightly less popular than average
    3. average popularity
    4. slightly more popular than average
    5. very popular

30. How do you think you compare with the other workers in your section? I am
    1. far below average
    2. slightly below average
    3. about average
    4. slightly better than average
    5. much better than average

31. I feel that I know what is expected of me in my job
    1. quite well
    2. well
    3. average
    4. fair
    5. poor

32. Do you feel that your supervisor has provided training for you so that you can
    1. handle only present job with difficulty
    2. handle present job adequately
    3. handle some other jobs other than present job
    4. handle most other jobs as well as present job
    5. handle any other job satisfactorily in the section

33. How do you think your supervisor compares you with the other workers in the section? I feel he considers me among
    1. the top group of workers
    2. slightly better than average group
    3. average group
    4. slightly below average group
    5. far below average group

34. Do you feel resentment to Navy type discipline?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

35. Do you feel that civilians resent taking orders from Navy personnel?
    1. all the time
    2. most of the time
    3. some of the time
    4. not often
    5. never

36. What are your feelings about working for women supervisors?
   1. I definitely dislike having a woman supervisor
   2. I dislike having a woman supervisor
   3. I have no preference for either a male or female supervisor
   4. I like having a woman supervisor
   5. I strongly favor having a woman supervisor

37. What are your feelings about working under a Wave Officer in comparison with a civilian woman supervisor?
   1. I definitely dislike having a Wave supervisor
   2. I dislike having a Wave supervisor
   3. I have no preference for either a Wave or civilian woman supervisor
   4. I like having a Wave supervisor
   5. I strongly prefer having a Wave supervisor

38. In general, do you feel that women supervisors pay too much attention to petty details?
   1. all the time
   2. most of the time
   3. some of the time
   4. not often
   5. never

39. In general, do you feel that women supervisors allow personalities to influence their decisions more than men?
   1. all the time
   2. most of the time
   3. some of the time
   4. not often
   5. never

40. Do you feel that your supervisor does not like to see you get too good on your job or try to get ahead too fast?
   1. all the time
   2. most of the time
   3. some of the time
   4. not often
   5. never

You are requested to answer the remaining questions on this questionnaire. You are requested to comment freely and frankly. These opinions will be held confidential and only a study of summarized data will be made.

I. What do you feel is the best way to get along with your supervisor? (Be specific):

J. What suggestions do you feel, if heeded, would tend to improve your supervisor in his inter-personal relations on the job? (Be specific):

K. What do you <u>like</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>Navy</u> supervisor?

L. What do you <u>dislike</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>Navy</u> supervisor?

M. What do you <u>like</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>civilian</u> supervisor?

N. What do you <u>dislike</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>civilian</u> supervisor?

O. What do you <u>like</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>male</u> supervisor?

P. What do you <u>dislike</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>male</u> supervisor?

Q. What do you <u>like</u> <u>most</u> about working for a <u>woman</u> supervisor?

R. What do you dislike most about working for a woman supervisor?

S. The space below is provided for you in case you desire to discuss anything that tends to make YOUR job or job situation less satisfying to you:

Your cooperation in helping with this research project is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this research project is to attempt to bring to light those personal inter-relationships that cause frictions, misunderstandings, and which result in personnel problems and tensions between male and female, military and civilian personnel in supervisory and non-supervisory levels. By getting YOUR frank opinions about those conflicts within the organization within which you are now working, it is hoped that a way will be pointed towards facilitating better understanding between these different levels and types of supervision. Only by getting YOUR opinion concerning what bothers YOU in these relationships now, can it be hoped to improve these relationships later.

Other than YOUR OWN FRANK OPINIONS there are no right and wrong answers to the following questions. Do NOT place your name or any identifying marks upon the questionnaire.

****

A. My status is as follows (place circle around number of applicable answer):

1. Male, Officer, Married
2. Male, Officer, Single
3. Male, Civilian, Married
4. Male, Civilian, Single
5. Female, Civilian, Married
6. Female, Civilian, Single
7. Female, Officer, Married
8. Female, Officer, Single
9. Female, Enlisted, Married
10. Female, Enlisted, Single
11. Male, Enlisted, Married
12. Male, Enlisted, Single

B. My age is:

1. under 20
2. over 20 -- under 25
3. over 25 -- under 30
4. over 30 -- under 35
5. over 35 -- under 40
6. over 40 -- under 45
7. over 45 -- under 50
8. over 50

C. I have the following service:

1. less than 6 mos.
2. more than 6 mos-less than 1 year
3. more than 1 year-less than 5 years
4. more than 5 years-less than 10 years
5. more than 10 years-less than 15 years
6. more than 15 years-less than 20 years
7. more than 20 years

D. I have been on my present job:

1. less than 6 months
2. more than 6 months-less than 1 year
3. more than 1 year---less than 5 years
4. more than 5 years

E. My immediate supervisor is:

1. Male, Officer, Married
2. Male, Officer, Single
3. Male, Civilian, Married
4. Male, Civilian, Single
5. Female, Civilian, Married
6. Female, Civilian, Single
7. Female, Officer, Married
8. Female, Officer, Single
9. Female, Enlisted, Married
10. Female, Enlisted, Single
11. Male, Enlisted, Married
12. Male, Enlisted, Single

F. I have supervision over (check most appropriate category):

1. Officers
2. Officers, and Civilians (Male and Female)
3. Officers, and Civilians (Male)
4. Officers, and Civilians (Female)
5. Civilians, (Male and Female)
6. Civilians (Male)
7. Civilians (Female)
8. I exercise no supervision
9. Other.....(list type).

G. My general impression of those who supervise me is:

1. excellent
2. very good
3. good
4. fair
5. poor

H. My general impression of those whom I supervise is:

1. excellent
2. very good
3. good
4. fair
5. poor

You are requested to answer the following questions by circling that answer which more closely approximates YOUR FEELINGS in each case.

[illegible] I

Question 1. What do you feel is the best way to get along with your supervisor? (Be specific)

Group A

"Be the subdiltor"

"Be work as instructed, if [illegible]

Carry the good fortune to work [illegible] is [illegible]
Then show the [illegible] to [illegible] so we may get efficiently

Get the work done. [illegible] don't bother about complaining about unreasonable or heavy discussions that you should be [illegible] in first. If the other says black is white, don't argue.

Do your job to the best of your ability. Do what is by the guidance set up by the supervision

Do what is necessary; do a good days work; [illegible] to personnel under my charge as accurately and as clearly as possible

Be fair and express as possible

by being chart, [illegible], support you need

to do the job assigned

[illegible]

do work and do it well, do it when told and as quickly as possible

by producing
[illegible] only if there is [illegible]

Group II

Do as you are told and if in any way you are [illegible] with a suggestion should mention same to him or her

cooperate. Do your work well. Pay attention

Cooperate and if you don't like what is [illegible] it but with the instead of grumbling to the other workers

Appendix C
Question I - Group II (cont.)

Try to do your best. Be earnest. Do what you are told to do

Do the work that is required of you and do it well

Do what he asks you to do. Explain to him if you don't understand what he means if you don't quite catch on

Be alert, offer suggestions, be prompt, courteous, accurate, neat in appearance

Cooperate with him and the unit as a whole

Do things their way

Do the work that my job requires accurately. Be fairly quick on the job and try not do things that irritate his or her

Do your work well and help out others in a pinch

To do what is required of you to the best of your ability and not try to pass the buck

Learn your work. Be sure of your work. Only ask questions when a new problem arises. Don't get too personal

By trying to do as much of my work as possible as my supervisor is easily upset.

Group III

I have tried different ways but have failed I do not believe in "playing up" to them, so I do not know

By saying yes at all times

To cooperate and frankly discuss problems

Do your work right, be at work on time; try not to ask too many questions, show respect and you will be respected

Be efficient in your position assignment. Suggest procedures to improve work production

By being a conscientious worker

Show better than average productivity. Base your statements to him on facts. Take as little of his time as possible

Appendix C
Question I - Group III (cont.)

To do exactly as he suggests from his own opinion (not our own) otherwise work will be returned to us until it is changed to accord with his ideas

Always agree with him. Do not contradict him or argue with him

To follow his instruction. When in doubt to ask his assistance. Do not go above his head to a higher authority unless you consult him first

Group IV

Do the work to the best of your ability and attend to your own and not others work

Agree, try to help--do your best

To do the job well so that there won't be any question about "getting" or "not getting" along. Do it well enough so there won't be any reason for him to criticize you. If you have any questions, ask him and get better results

Be honest in everything. Consider my supervisor a friend instead of someone who is against me. Confide all the difficulties I encounter in my work to him if he has the power to alter them. Do the work to the best of my ability

Do good work

Do what I am told to do, show a decided interest of my own in the job, and use my initiative at times

To try to please him with my work, and treat him as my superior. Doing the job to the best of my ability

Do as he asks

Do what is expected of me on my job--mind my own business

Follow orders and do your work well. Be polite. Have a sense of humor and use common sense

Group V

Learn what is expected of you--then do it and a little more. Keep on your toes--observe. In short, keep your eyes and ears open and your big mouth shut, unless you're asking a question. Remem as a general rule argue too much over the "why" of it

Appendix C
Question I - Group V (cont.)

By doing my work to the best of my ability and refraining from letting temper affect my judgments

Be frank, open, and above board in all dealings. Be fair and do your best work

Do my work quickly and accurately; quit complaining about conditions in the office; observe the chain of command more closely

To do as he asks. Regardless of what kind of work is to be done

To have him assign me specific duties and stick to them and not have me doing work for 3 or 4 officers when I am really assigned to one only. To have him be fair in handing out "liberty"

To use a good Navy term "apple polish." Flatter her. Make her think you consider her exceptional in all things

It is an impossibility to get along with my supervisor. Her disposition does not allow her to treat her charges as fellow workers in a civil manner

To do my tasks to the best of my ability. To accept responsibility. To accept new and unusual assignments gracefully. To frankly discuss any problems

Just to do my job and not ask her any questions when she is in a bad mood

Group VI

Get that mother fucker out of here

The thing is you will have to wait until he is on the right side especially when he get out of bed

There is no way. The only way is that I be transferred to some other station or sea

Being in the Navy stick to regulation if he does. Respect if he respect you. But being he is of a superior rate a subordinate can only say so much whether he likes or dislikes

Do your work well. Move when he say do it. Pay attention to his command

To be honestly partial to everyone regardless their nationality

Appendix C
Question I - Group VI (cont.)

By working alongside him every minute and never leave his side That way I am sure that he will recognize my usefulness in both labor and cleanliness

Prompt obedience of orders--respect of rate. Give him a kick in the ass when he gets too familiar personal with you

To lick up behind him at all times

Do as you are told and stay out of his way

Question J. What suggestions do you feel, if needed, would tend to improve your supervisor in his inter-personal relations on the job? (Be specific)

Group I

he could be more cheerful in the morning

mingle with the personnel and understand their problems more

do not set a procedure in effect until absolutely certain it will not be vetoed

give more specific methods of procedure in doing a job. And keep people thoroughly informed on changes

to have more of a personal relation with the employes rather than a strict business attitude

give more specific methods of procedures in doing a job. And keep people thoroughly informed on changes

most situations are not his fault. High brass passes orders down the line and expect compliance. No one here can reasonably put in his two cents worth and receive consideration

induce top management to untie his hands so he can fulfil his responsibilities of his position effectively

when policy changes are made, get the entire unit together and have a general discussion of the change

Group II

Less personal communication between supervisor and employee

If a person does do work wrong let him do it over again correctly

Appendix C
Question J - Group II (cont.)

Wouldn't get angry and look out at one person instead of a group

Be fair with everyone, let work be fairly distributed in his section

To be accurate himself

Having more time to devote to exactly that

Get the latest rules of the job so he can give out information to employees

The supervisor should not be too busy on personal business

He should do things more thoroughly and carefully

None that I know of. She is kind and tolerant and advises us when necessary

Group III

If he did not make employees feel inferior it would help a lot

Try to understand that we are being held responsible for some of the sloppy descriptions written just so that our unit can keep up with the quota

Send every supervisor to Supervisors School

The knowledge that his decisions will be backed by his superiors

Know his personnel and their problems

I think that the supervisor has too much work to accomplish, and leaving her not enough time to devote more time to train and explain the work to the individual worker

Take a more personal interest in his employees

By supervisor asking opinions as to how the work should be done. Workers have many times better ideas than supervisors

The supervisors may know their job, but not any that I've had know how to handle people

Section 2
Section 2 - Draft 21 (Lucia)

Similarly, you engage, and I will use of the second function as a general

In light of this consequence, had would be finally determined in his
medicine.

So be commonly burning.

Another-more time to convince the assembly that

The new Chinese religion of the Qin so he was life, one following
to medicine

The medicine should not be full long as essential functions

It should be things more immediately our mortality

Then that I know not. This is what makes thinking and believing so close
nowadays

Section III

If he did not make medicine that definitely it would lack a lot

The ten laboratory work we are lucky will eventually the many of
the always discriminating written, but we that we will see long
as also the work.

Real energy preserving in Buddhism texts

The knowledge that his limitations will be tested by the experiments

Some life commonly and their medicine

I think that the structure has two main ones be specialists, such
lacks or has not always this in Chinese medicine. So medic not medical
his work to the individual medicine

Time a more general interest in his analogies

Or scientific medicine medicine as the two for ever would be stuck.
Medicine lacks only these lacks further than questions

The questions may have that lack only the not and that (Pu's had some
for so hundred people

Appendix C
Question J (cont.)

Group IV

I don't think there is any better. No one is perfect, but he is the best supervisor I've ever had

Develop more personal interest

A little time to become more acquainted with his work, as he is new at the job

Know more specifically how much work has to be done with every task he assigns. Then he would know why the task takes so much time to accomplish

Not to be too straight-laced. He's a wonderful man but I can't talk to him person to person

Group V

If she would try and be more pleasant with the personnel

To show no partiality toward some workers. To allow favors and to distribute the work and expect results equally

I definitely think there could be no improvement

A change of jobs. Maybe if she found a complete new crew to work with her personal feelings would allow her more pleasant working attitudes

Give her a course in the proper manner of handling people

If he was assured of his position rather than worrying about someone stepping in his place. Also insufficient work with an over-abundance of personnel doesn't help inter-personal relations on the job

When a change is made on the station affecting enlisted personnel he should get the group together and "give us the word". Too often only half our office gets it because the other half are not in the other room that the one in which he is located

If he didn't have so many other bosses

He is a little timid and a little afraid to speak up, even though he knows his point is right

Appendix C
Question J - Group V (cont.)

Stop being such an old woman and grumbleish type

The chief is about 4.0--as chiefs go. I'll "buy" the way he is

Group VI

He just need someone to talk to him

You can't tell him nothing. best for him to leave

To stop trying to be a fucking show-off in front of officers; talk to the men as if they were men and not slave-dogs

Think more of the men feelings and not only of the work to be done

To be fair with all hands

He could stop eating cheese (informing to brass hats) and live with the men instead of trying to live above them and also here those under him

To be cooperative to all men under him, give no favors to certain groups

Informers should be stepped on instead of praised. Should mingle more with his men instead of putting himself on a higher level

If you mean R.... (nothing)

Replacement

Question K. What do you like most about working for a Navy supervisor?

Group I

not anything

I like him to act in an advisory capacity only

He is business like and knows regulations and will follow the book. His orders are based on regs.

Impartiality

Appendix C
Question E (cont.)

Group II

More discipline

He sees that you are properly acquainted with your job and not let you go on sort of hap-hazardly

They are alright. Most of them are helpful when you need help

They seem more interested in getting the work out. More businesslike

The dignity of an officer lends force to orders and insure less resentment in carrying out

They know what they want and show the work is finished, it's done

He is strict regardless of whose work it is

Very exacting

They are very specific and strict to details

Group III

I think most Navy supervisors are fair and appreciate the work done by civilians

He usually does not bother you too much in your work

Impartiality

His background of experience usually contributes a lot towards determining field requirements

They do not push you too hard

Group IV

It doesn't make much difference. They're all human beings--whether Navy or civilian

He knows exactly what the more important work is and doesn't bother with minor details

Congeniality. Their unprejudiced attitudes

Their efficient way of doing things

Exercise 2
Exercise 2 (cont.)

Items 11

Deep Disorientation

It seems that you are probably experiencing difficulties with current job and may lack in your sense of self-confidence.

Other deep disorientation. Look at your environment, those you know best.

Other deep seated disturbance in relating the need work. Deep frustration.

Our disorder is an attempt to avoid or escape from the pressure your feeling disorientated in everything has.

Other deep seated deep need and those not seem to satisfactorily with those

It is which expectations of reason even in life

Deep disorder.

Other deep seated disorder not allow to stability

Items 12

I think your deep disorientation may lead you increasingly into trying that by activities

It usually does not matter you feel the need to feel deep

Instability

His background of experience usually contributes to his feeling disorientation. Social responsibility

Other he and with you has been

Items 13

It usually only some difference. Further and one a [illegible] deep or stability

It being usually used to a deep [illegible] and it has brought [illegible] this deep stability

Insecurity. Study motivational difficulty

Short sufficiency and of being [illegible]

Appendix C
Question 8 (cont.)

Group V

There's never doubt as to where you stand. Then I prefer Navy to civilian--I like "navy-style"

More impartial in his assignments and criticism

All in this together--brothers under the same sun

They give an order and expect it to be carried out

They are understanding. They realize your situation and understand the rules and regs you must follow

They know and understand how you feel about the work

They don't hang over your shoulder to see if the work gets done

Being in the Navy, it's the only logical type of supervision

They understand about time taken for other military requirements and other Navy activities. Their mental attitude is much the same as mine

I have some confidence in them

They don't begrudge you some of the liberties you are given

Group VI

Not a god damned thing

Some of them tell you what to do and leave you alone to do your work

You can call on the book when he wishes to unclog his own cabbage

He is strictly a regulation leader

I like the way they handle their men

They are easier to work for

All right if your supervisor is fair

Friendly

He knows just what to do

Appendix C
Question K - Group VI (cont.)

They understand that your work is never done

I just like the Navy

Question L. What do you dislike most about working for a Navy supervisor?

Group I

lack of specific instruction and orientation

they are too strict and abide too much by Navy rule rather than business rules

talks to people like dirt or third class seaman. Most officers rate themselves too high

they are generally hampered in diplomacy and tact by Navy logs and top management

too much of a militaristic mind, believes the same thing can be done to civilians as can be done to navy personnel

the tendency to adopt the policy of this is right because I'm Navy and Navy is always right

trying to use Navy tactics on civilians and that don't work

everything

nothing

Group II

They seem to minimize the importance of a civilian job

Sometimes can become too domineering

Discipline is the most important thing to him from the time you start to the time you end

They throw around their authority and let the civilians do all the work

Don't like them when they think they are better than anyone else

They sometimes think they are better than the rest

Appendix C
Question L - Group II (cont.)

Everything has to be too exact or perfect. It's nice to be that way but it should be overlooked at times

Group III

They worry too much about red tape

They expect immediate service

No dislikes. The individual personality is the determining factor

Those gold bars won't hold them up forever

He is usually uninformed about civil service rules; is usually only interested in his promotion, not the civilians

All things must be done the Navy way regardless

Changing of personnel by transfer too often

Group IV

Their superiority

Some of them carry a far too superior attitude

Their "I don't care" attitude

Cannot become too friendly with him

Group V

That the credit of a job well done always goes to the officer, not his subordinates

Some Navy supervisors are a little rate or rank happy

Every now and then they give you the old story of being on call "twenty-four" hours per day

No consideration for off-duty hours

On call 24 hours a day. Living on base—too close to your work and can be called back too readily

Sometimes you get one who stresses this "because I say" —while rate-pulling.

Appendix C
Question L (cont.)

Group VI

Some of them do not no how to run the navy orders

If he trust all men right it is ok

I don't dislike working for Navy supervisors

You can't get any favors through him

Historical attitude and feel one must jump like a rabbit at their slightest request

Practically everything

Some don't know how to work men

Question M. What do you like most about working for a civilian supervisor?

Group I

They act more like our equal

They are eye to eye with you

a civilian supervisor should understand the problem confronting a civilian employee, and better relations should result

no caste system is involved

They are usually stable and philosophical in business relationships

they are more of business men and women and tend to see things in the same light as we do

more understanding, less criticism

can argue your point

Group II

They understand your problems more

They seem to be fair

Appendix C
Question 8 - Group II (cont.)

Except for higher rating they are in the same boat as you are

We have more in common. Also to leave work

Seem to have more understanding regarding personal and business matters

They seem to understand another civilians aggressiveness better than a Navy supervisor.

Group III

Doesn't have that military attitude

They have the civilian viewpoint

He has more understanding for the personnel problems

Presents ideas in an informal way

He is more able to understand his employees personal problems

You can discuss matters with him better

He usually resides in one locality and a permanently located supervisory personnel is highly desirable

They have the same problems

Group IV

Can become friendly with him; but not much more than with Navy

His fairness

His desire to do a good job

Friendliness

They feel like and are like one of us

Group V

As Navy under civilian supervisor--I don't like anything about it

You can quit when you want

Then secure time comes, usually they quit

Appendix C
Question E - Group V (cont.)

Nothing--I think Navy personnel should work under Navy

They are less strict when it comes to discipline

Resent civilians in most cases

Group VI

I don't like

Some of them are nice and realize the great advantage they have over you but disregard it

It won't make any different whether civilian or serviceman

You can abuse them and only get fired

They don't know how to give orders

Never worked for one

Friendly

Question K. What do you dislike most about working for a civilian supervisor?

Group I

Lack of specific instruction and orientation

I don't

they have a tendency to look out for themselves too much

if a person gets chummy with a supervisor then he makes work easy for him or her

the same prejudices that I might have for any man or woman as far as personalities are concerned

only some of their dispositions and temperments

Group II

Not enough authority or final say-so

Appendix C
Question 8 (cont.)

Group III

Too much on the slave driver style

Frequently of a non-Navy background and not aware of the special problems arising in Navy

His desire to get ahead too fast

I don't dislike anything

Some supervisors don't even speak a personal word or greeting with an employee and feel too far superior toward him

Navy are good technical men but poor supervisors

Ones we have here are afraid of their job so they play up to their superiors

Group IV

Prejudice

Too businesslike

Cannot understand Navy problems

Group V

They seem to resent that you have a few privileges

They seem to resent Navys and make working conditions as uncomfortable as possible. They resent time taken for Navy instruction--leave, etc.

Their interest is in civilian personnel and not in Navy

Had I desired civilian supervisor I would have remained in civilian life

They always act as though they are underpaid

They are always picky about the work and are always trying to find something wrong with it

They do not have to follow our rules and regulations. We are under strict discipline--they aren't. If they want to quit they can--we must take it

Their attitude against Navy and their general opinion

Appendix C
Question N - Group V(cont.)

Not enough in common

Because they are not fair in their judgments toward Navy personnel

As Navy under a civilian supervisor, I dislike the whole set-up

Group VI

Guss you

If he is a civilian and treat me right is ok

Don't know

To much work and responsibility

I don't dislike

Either take advantage of the Navy Day and hold it over your head and no matter what he does you have no regulation to put on him

They know when their day work is done but feel that yours is never

No reason at all

Question O. What do you like most about working for a male supervisor?

Group I

Being a male myself, I get along better with men

They understand problems more clearly than women

he generally has more patience

their innate stability

he has more of a feeling for his people than a female supervisor would have

more emotionally stable

more to the point and exact on what should be done. Think first then give orders

Seem to be more on the mens level

less emotional

Appendix C
Question 8 (cont.)

Group II

They are not usually prejudiced

They are more demanding and their attention is more to the work than to personal individuals

They seem to be easier to get along with

They are usually impartial

Most male supervisors are less personal and more exact in details

They seem impartial

Group III

I believe a man can get more done

They give you a job to do and leave you alone

He has a better judgment in setting up his work

No personalities

The knowledge that in his own personal life he faces the same problems that I do and is more apt to treat his employees respectfully

They are easier to talk to

Usually always on the job, wider absent

They have the same personal problems

Personalities are not as apt to influence a man and petty details are not over-stressed.

Group IV

They are more considerate

He seems to be more fair and does not pay much attention to unimportant details

They allow you to do your own share of the work without interference

They seem to favor women

Appendix C
Question C (cont.)

Group V

His ability to handle women and keep them happy in their jobs. Then, too, men are much more appreciative

They are less concerned about the petty details and as a general rule easier to get along with

More even tempered

Generally considerate of their personnel

They are understanding and hold no grudge against you personally

There is more understanding and appreciation from them

They take you out and buy you a drink occasionally

Men aren't as apt to be as petty as women supervisors and generally keep personal matters out of the office

They are fairer and much easier to work with

They are easier to talk to. No partiality is shown.

Group VI

I neither like or dislike

Most men can understand another man

You can approach him as a man on any problem. You are not afraid to say anything for he is just another man

He would not be as strict as a woman

I can handle him without kitten gloves

Friendship

Question F. What do you dislike most about working for a male supervisor?

Group I

Women and if they take advantage of no

ruling

Appendix C
Question 7 (cont.)

Group II

At times they push one so much

They sometimes ignore the females and help the men more to get ahead

Group III

Do not consider you as high as they and look down on you

No dislikes

He is apt to let his desire to improve his superior make his unpopular

His favoritism towards a few selected ones who know well how to bluff

Some are too considerate to female employees

Group IV

They seem domineering

Some male supervisors have a tendency to discredit suggestions made by a woman

No personal interest

They are so nosey!!

Group V

At times they are a trifle crude

I prefer a man anytime to a woman

They "kick" when your boy friends visit you at your desk

Impatience

Bearing of their personal responsibes

Nothing in personal. I usually get along with them

Their broad masculine superiority--but learn the ropes--and that is usually handled (blows them)

Group VI

I do not dislike working for a male supervisor

Appendix C
Question 7 - Group VI (cont.)

He expects you to do the heaviest work

I think them if they are impartial and easily excited and if they have the domineering attitude

To see them stand around and point out things to do when you are doing something else

Question 4. What do you like most about working for a woman supervisor?

Group I

Some are more pleasing to look at

no discrim nations

I would not like to work for a woman supervisor at all

Group II

Dog eat dog attitude

Generally sympathetic. Rare in women

She understands

Can discuss personal problems more freely

Group III

Do not like woman supervisors

A woman supervisor shows usually a better understanding for an employee's mistakes and tries not to discourage and hurt him in his efforts

Male or female makes no difference as long as the supervisor is fully aware of the requirements of the job and leads his workers to an orderly, correct solution of the problem of the day

Get thoroughly accurate information

Group IV

Getting things out on schedule

Their personal concern

Appendix D
Question 1 - Section VI (cont.)

Do opposite pros to do this football game

I thought those if they were important and really needed and if they were the backpacking activity

To see they should connect and point out things to do when you are doing activities alone

Question 2. What do you like most about working for a young experiment?

Answer I

Have new ones planning to look at

on discrete numbers

I would not like to work in a room underneath us all

Answer II

Any not dog activity

Generally a relative. Does in groups

Non-motivated

Non-dangerous physical problems were freely

Answer III

Do not like young experiments

A young scientist doing length a further understanding for an employer's relative and other ask to discovery and have the is big activity

Only or people other is different as long as the observation is fully aware of the responsibility of the job and lands the machine is an honest, normal activities of the problem or the dog

Not thoroughly accurate information

Answer IV

Lasting things are no results

Short lasting are done

Appendix C
Question 2 - Group IV (cont.)

Were of a personal interest

As long as any person knows his or her job and is fair with all employees, I see no difference. All are human regardless. It is always good to be told when a good job is done as well as a poor one

It's easier to take orders from a woman

Group V

Nothing. Women are ok--don't get so wrong--but they won't just let you do your job--they generally drag personalities into it

I don't like them

If she is considerate and understanding and can handle people I like one very much

I strongly prefer male supervisors as I have no likes for a women supervisor

Too much pettiness

Group VI

Kindness

She can understand things better than men can do

They like to talk too much for me

I never did like the idea. I find a woman supervisor is rather in her work. There not there I can say for them

I dislike it

Clean surroundings, light work and kindness

They're women

If she treat all hand fair is ok.

Question 3. What do you dislike most about working for a woman supervisor?

Group I

A woman as a supervisor in my opinion has a tendency to be persuaded to change her position in a matter

Appendix C
Question 8 - Group I (cont.)

personalities enter in too much

a woman supervisor is too picky and more or less looks for an excuse to bitcher about

too personal. Two men can call each other bastards and still get the work out. It is fun. Women get too petty and complaining.

their inmate instability

no dislikes

women are women

they usually get excited too easily

unfairness

Group II

A woman in a supervisory capacity seems to get too job conscious and wants everyone to keep his nose to the grind

Sometimes shows too much favoritism

Too much personality enters into it

They seem to be more stern with other females

They are critical of what the girls wear and how they look. Expect more from you

Group III

Too bossy

Women seem to let a little sense of authority go to their head and too often show favoritism

Too fickle

A woman supervisor depends too much on her mood in dealing with the personnel

Should not be used to supervise men

I dislike even the idea of working for a woman

Appendix C
Question A (cont.)

Group IV

A woman never makes a good supervisor. Women as a rule are always jealous of each other

Jealousy among other co-workers

They're more temperamental than men

Group V

Too precise

Some are ok but some are very irritable if they have personal trouble at home

In most cases a woman is not qualified for supervision

The attitude women with authority acquire. They feel above your level in every aspect

They are catty and are usually very hard on another woman

They are too curious about your private life

There is too much jealousy and pettiness

Too fussy about details. Like to show their authority

Hold grudges, too sensitive, lacks tact and diplomacy in giving orders

Her tendency to be too "bossy"

Women never forget they are dealing with another woman--personalities enter into it too much

Group VI

She expect your work to be beautifying and satisfactory and also sissy

Most of them I find impartial. Their methods are different from mens. I find a woman easier to have something put over on

If they don't like you then look out for troubles

Some think their face is better than you

Appendix C (cont.)

Question 6. The space below is provided for you in case you desire to discuss anything that tends to make YOUR job or job situation less satisfying to you:

Group I

The place of business is too corrupt

Too many short-sighted procedural changes instigated by an inexperienced planning and management control staff, against the better judgement of the more experienced stock control division personnel.

Passing out rates to unqualified people. Any jerk who worked a few years in his father's grocery store is a buyer and rates a CAF 4. The poor guy who learns the hard way sits back and watches the loafers get promoted and even says what the hell's the use and becomes a loafer too. The motto here seems to be, "Do as little as possible." So that. This is the worst place I have ever worked in regards to morale, fair play and teamwork. Everyone seems to be pulling his own little cart and the hell with the next guy. No cooperation at all between sections and divisions. I would say this section is held up by about 25 good people. If they would leave, the place would fall apart. These people have taken it upon themselves to find things out, call attention to difficulties and do something about it. I feel most of the people here couldn't hold a decent job outside.

Again, a lack of orientation, for new as well as old employees, as to the over-all picture of what we are doing.

I think that personnel who make a few mistakes due to pressure of a work load should not be condemned but should be allowed to prove their accuracy when not under pressure. This is not practiced often enough.

I believe some Navy personnel dislike having civilian personnel supervise them or work with them. They try to run down individuals.

The fact that under Navy supervision I feel advancement for those individuals of the minority group have little chance for advancement, regardless of ability and initiative.

Group II

The only dissatisfaction I experience is the fact that the people who are entirely remote from the actual specific working conditions involved make the rules and regulations governing those conditions. There is no one better qualified to evaluate what is most conducive to his or her own efficiency than the individual involved. Personal attention cannot be given to individuals in a large organization but too often individuals are entirely a victim of the system which completely curtails their ability.

[illegible] 6 (cont'd)

Question 6. The women below be supplied for you in case you desire to discuss supplying sub-[illegible] to some [illegible] or job [illegible]

Jane [illegible] to your

Scene X

The place of business in the morning

The body [illegible]-light [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by an [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Appendix C
Question 8 - Group II (cont.)

I feel foolish answering these foolish questions

I dislike doing other peoples work when they can handle it themselves. If they can't, it should be explained to me. This is especially true when the work is supposed to be done by someone in another section with a higher grade.

Group III

The fact that the supervisor makes me feel inferior makes the job less satisfying than any other factor.

I admire and respect a supervisor who is able to hear out and evaluate the merits of a proposal which is in absolute contradiction to his plans. A supervisor must be able to use overall perspective in his section, at the same time clearing petty details upon which the success of a plan often hinges.

A sore subject is correspondence, drawings, etc. It passes through too many hands. For instance a Chicago supplier can call on urgently required drawing to _____. It has taken us to 7 days to reach the individual who asked for it. On the other hand if it is sent straight to the individual delivery can and has been effected in less than 24 hours!

When a civilian is working for the military he is working for a living as though he were working for private industries. He doesn't especially care for regimentation. When he is late or forgets to report his time it seems unnecessary to make such an enormous issue of it.

I would feel much happier in my job if the higher-ups, and the immediate supervisors, would exchange from time to time a personal word or greeting with me. This concerns civilian and military supervisors likewise. It gives you the feeling that you are not just another number in the chain of employees (no. 4818). A word of encouragement by these higher-ups would be a great morale booster. Nobody can be too busy to say that he has no time for a casual greeting or that he or she feels it under his or her dignity to talk to a subordinate employee.

A good supervisor should always be on the job before 8 a.m. no matter if he lives in Chicago or not. He can't expect his workers to settle down to work at 8 a.m. if he isn't there himself. He should know what his workers are doing and where they are at all times and insist that his workers do not spend ½ their time visiting.

Workers who want to eat with their wives who have different lunch hours should be transferred to their wives sections as it is most of them take an hour lunch period. Each person should be treated the same.

[illegible]

[illegible] – [illegible] (Sears)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Appendix C
Question 2 - Group III (cont.)

I believe that _____ is completely disorganized. You have to be on the so-called "Friendship Train" to advance. It is who you are "hand being" with and not your ability to do a job. There is too much undercurrent in this office. There is not a pleasing, or cooperative among the employees. The supervisors are mostly from _____ and only their friends seem to be advancing. Also they do not know how to handle personnel. A good example of who gets the new ratings, the last three months that were supposed to be changed, I people got the ratings, no one knew they were going, someone found out, complained, so a bulletin came out that everyone was supposed to be given a chance at it, but the same three men kept the rating and my record was not even removed from the file.

Group IV

I am very pleased with my job and there are a few things that get under my skin sometimes. I usually blame those things on myself because at other times the same thing might happen and not bother me in the least. Every place I've worked there was always a few dislikes, but after you realize the difficulties, you find that things aren't as bad as they seem and could be worse.

I feel my job is satisfactory. I get along with my superiors and when I fail it is because of my own mishaps. But, I find the malicious gossip and rumors among personnel damaging and harmful toward my job, and this causes me, if anything, to feel dissatisfied.

No chance for advancement is a big factor which tends to cause my dislike my job. Otherwise I like it very much.

Group I

I would be much nicer to work if when you ask your supervisor anything pertaining to the work that you would get an answer in a nice tone of voice instead of being talked to just like you are an idiot and that she hurts herself to answer a person.

I do believe a supervisor should only be qualified for that type of job if he or she could have a very nice personality and skill to get along with people.

My job would be more satisfying if I felt that my boss was fully aware of my duties and tasks and the work accomplished by me—and the time spent achieving an end. Also if the work assigned to my subordinates could be more equally distributed. If one of these men could be favored with the fact that he must do the assigned work when assigned and not to be allowed to do as he pleases and when he pleases.

[illegible]

[illegible] – Story III [Local]

I believe that _____ is [illegible]. You have to be on the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. It is who you are. Really [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Appendix C
Question 3 - Group V (cont.)

I would like a male (preferably Navy) supervisor who shows an interest, gives credit where credit is due. Good

My supervisor is an ex-first class storekeeper. It is impossible to understand her reasons for treating Naval personnel with such contempt. She resents military people and seems to enjoy kowtowing than in her dealings with their officers and CPOs. She seems to be a frustrated old maid and dislikes the comradeship between sailors and Marines. She has created such an extreme civilian element herself she is completely without friends in the office. People leave a room when she enters. Due to an intense dislike toward my supervisor this is a very biased paper.

This form hardly applies to my job, inasmuch as I don't have a specified assigned position. To describe the discrepancies would be very easy, as I don't know from one day to another as to what my assignment will be. Being of the same rating as my supervisor puts him in an awkward position, as a result I am assigned the work that he doesn't want to do himself.

In the office I work in the same confusion seems to happen every time a "special" course showed for training duty. After two years in an office that handles reserve orders a person would think that in that time the department would be at a point where there is a minimum error. Still at this date people report aboard without orders (they still get lost), names of orders are wrong, and numerous other discrepancies occur. The result is "unpolished frustration."

Just get rid of the civilians; that is not true in one case and the rule in another. I would much rather have a woman tell me what to do than any civilian (male or female).

In the one instance the supposed ignorance (by some) of received knowledge tends to place some work on other individuals. Number of others also pass more work onto others as it is thought wise to leave such a worker alone and avoid any complaints or disturbances. Refusal to do certain jobs which are thus placed upon someone else.

My particular complaint is that I have two many supervisors. Primary duty is passed to the branch chief, leaving me considerable spare time. My spare time is devoted to another section, making it necessary for me to at least two jobs, neither one of which keeps me busy. Comments and criticisms given always are for my primary supervisor and do not in most cases fit my enlisted supervisor. Since I am qualified in my rate, I do not enjoy doing work that any competent non-rated man could do as well. The job I have been assigned on this station has strengthened, rather than lessened, my opinion that the Navy does not, in most cases, utilize the male, both civilian and enlisted, in the best possible manner.

Appendix C
Variation 4 - Group 2 Trials.

I would like a note (handwriting Harry) concerning the Jews on installing gives result which should be done.

My interview is an electric chair situation. It is in Kensington. My [illegible] the Kensington Dry Cleaning Firm [illegible] this was [illegible]. The private [illegible] [illegible] to bring [illegible] in her [illegible] [illegible] 1939. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Appendix C
Question 2 - Group V (contd.)

My job is sometimes a bit boring, but never dissatisfying. But my job--cause it happens routine--is a bit boring. Whether or not "your" dissatisfied is up to you. On the whole I wouldn't want anything else on the station if given a say-so in the matter.

As I like my job and most of the people I work with I have no complaints to make.

Group VI

I think my chief is shit bird and should be put out of the navy as soon as possible because he no good. The reason I hate his ass is that every day were you all of the time never no day off. 2. He taps dip in personal affairs to much. 3. He does not keep his word. 4. He brings down the morall of the men. 5. He wants to run every minute is real. 6. As far as his being a chief which he is not and don't seem should up to his seniority. He wants to be the hole show and not just one of the managers but in the Navy there is room enough for every one to be done. But this man thinks he is the show. And I defin working under such supervision. As far as the Navy is concerned I like it.

If they would take pity on us and get that dam chief out of here everything would be all right he stay on your back to much. His always lader get a good break but the rest don't get a third time. I don't like him at all because he is no good to us or to Navy time.

Thing is a little bad around there I work at someone is all ways own your back. We just work to hard. I have been on this one job for a year and 2 1/2 months. They told us you will get a new job soon. Some people come and work their and was going in a few days about 4 or 5. I was intiged to make a career out of the navy but not like this. Some of the hard people should try and please do something before to kill us all was the job. Sometimes he is drunk and stay on our back and that is not right you know that your self.

First he is the worst person can I have ever worked for he is no good. Never understand anything you ask him but always wants some from you and last he is just a no good fat, your shiny, ____ ____ need to be gone right this minute. Thank you

I feel that the only way I can get along with my supervisior if he was gone I don't like working for this man. I do like working for a civilian supervision

I would like very much to leave here because I can't get along with the one that are over me. I were would like very much to get back on a very nice ship.

Appendix C
Question 5 - Group VI (cont.)

The supervisor in charge here often tend to put too much down pressure on the men--one sometimes show partiality between different sections on duty this giving up some (who were friends of mine) and causing them to sit in quib-odds.

As for thing the Chief do among if not enlist personnel from the Guard Branch come over and he will give him a plate and a special tour after the boys be late he wish give them no plate and it is three boys from the Guard Branch come over every day and that is not right.

They won't give me one of two houses that provide for naval personnel even though I know that I have got enough points (they go by a point system) to get one. The only reason that I can see is that I am a negro.

I feel that in the steward's branch I take more gripes and insults than most men in other branches. For instance, when officers come aboard in the morning, some their duties to here this they should chief is to only move that the steward makes it over. You take orders and trouble about the food and you are put the one who prepares it. Most officers are not satisfied with the work you do for them. Their surroundings are never good enough for them or their guests. If he is outnumbered you have to honor him, if he is angry you have to be a gentleman or jester to entertain his soul. My job is like that of a housewife and companion the liver with an invalid or ill minded human. If we could (officers and steward) live and cooperate with one another I am sure that my job would be a pleasant one, but with their gripes, intrusions for duty and using their rules to frighten us into slaving, I am sure that the stewards will always live in a career of slavery.

In my own words I would like to express that what I think about him. He is sometimes good, sometime bad cause what side of the bed he got up on. He only think about his self. He is lazy yet somehow like to do his work. I don't like him one bit.

_____ is the only man in the hold here that I don't give a good fuck about. If he leave this station today I could fill a lot better that I am reason so many boys have left here. And a lot of them would be here now if that Mother Fucker was not here. What big fat son of a bitch. Shoot that son of a bitch now.

As for the Navy enlisted personnel occupies the largest part. I think that the enlisted man should be able to have something to say as to the way it run. There are many situation upon which officer decide in which I find his decision unfair because he feel out and has not had experience the hardships and gripes of the enlisted. How can a man judge that he does not know the standard and hardship of those he judges. This I find in the situation between commission and enlisted personnel.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Appendix C
Question 6 - Group VI (cont.)

I would like very much if you could get Chief _____ out of the _____ ah cause because not any of the boy do not like him at all

My own job is my point. My supervisor is no good because he work so too much my day on or a week long and that is to show long to work.

I like all of the supervisory but some of this are not right so I like to be under a chiefs than to be working under this.

If we could get a leading petty officer in the place of this one we got the place would be one hundred per cent better because the one we got we have to take to much garbage off and there isn't anything we can do because he hang more with every officer that come on the station, with a rank from a lt. cmdr. so that the reason you cant get rid of him.

13 JAN 70
10 MAY 73
21 OCT 75
7 MAR 76
3 NOV 76
S 9446
22450
24116
24389
23637

11191

Thesis S25 Scharf
A study of attitudes in the area of supervisor-non-supervisor relations between groups of navy and civilian, male and female, personnel.

13 JAN 70
10 MAY 73
21 OCT 75
7 MAR 76
3 NOV 76
S 9446
22450
24116
24389
23637

11191

Thesis S25 Scharf
A study of attitudes in the area of supervisor-non-supervisor relations between groups of navy and civilian, male and female, personnel.

Library
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

ARTISAN GOLD LETTERING AND SMITH BINDERY OAKLAND, CALIF.

thesS25
A study of attitudes in the area of supe
3 2768 002 00330 3
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY